

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



LOS ANGELES **UNION STATION** Run-through Tracks Project

(SCH 2002061071)

December 2005

3-8 GEOLOGIC/SEISMIC

3-8.1 Existing Conditions

3-8.1.1 Regional Setting

The proposed project site is located along the southern edge of the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province, immediately adjacent to the northern end of the Los Angeles Basin. The Los Angeles Basin is a lowland coastal plain 80 kilometers (50 miles) long by 32 kilometers (20 miles) wide that slopes gradually southward and westward toward the Pacific Ocean. The coastal plain overlies a structural trough filled with a thick sequence of early Cenozoic¹ through Holocene marine and nonmarine sediments deposited as the basin subsided. Youngest sediments include alluvium deposited by the Los Angeles River.

The Los Angeles Basin occupies the intersection of the north-northwest trending Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province and the east-west trending Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province. The Peninsular Ranges are characterized by a series of mountain ranges and intervening valleys that extend from Los Angeles to Baja California. The Transverse Ranges, which form the northern boundary of the Los Angeles Basin, extend from Point Arguello eastward to the Joshua Tree National Monument, where they merge with the Mojave and Colorado deserts.

Southern California seismicity is dominated by the intersection of the north-northwest trending San Andreas fault system and the east-west trending Transverse Ranges fault system. The orientation and activity of both fault systems have resulted from strain that is produced by the relative motions of the Pacific and North American Tectonic Plates. This strain is relieved by right-lateral² strike-slip faulting on the San Andreas and related faults and by vertical, reverse-slip or left-lateral strike-slip displacement on faults in the Transverse Ranges. Effects of this structural deformation include mountain building, basin development, widespread regional uplift, and earthquake generation.

3-8.1.2 Topography, Slopes, and Major Drainage

The proposed project area is situated immediately west of the Los Angeles River, with segments approximately 0.8 kilometer (0.5 mile) from the river to segments running adjacent to the river. The river flows through a narrow floodplain between the Elysian Park and Repetto hills, and

¹ The Cenozoic era spans the time from 66 to 1.6 million years ago. The Quaternary period spans the time from 1.6 million years ago to the present. The Holocene, or Recent, epoch spans the end of the Quaternary period, from 11,000 years ago to the present.

² A *strike-slip fault* is a fault separating blocks of rock that slide past each other horizontally. A *right-lateral* strike-slip fault is a strike-slip fault on which the displacement of the more distant block is to the right when viewed from either side. On a *left-lateral* fault the displacement is in the opposite direction. A *reverse-slip* fault is a fault that dips at an angle below the surface on which the overhanging block of rock slides upward over the underlying block.

continues southward across the basin. Approximately 2.4 kilometers (1.5 miles) northeast of the proposed project area, the Arroyo Seco joins the river at the base of Elysian Park Hills, near Glendale Junction.

The proposed project area is relatively flat. Surface slopes very gently in an east-southeasterly direction toward the river, at a less than 1% slope gradient. Surface elevation generally ranges from about 88 meters (290 feet) above mean sea level (AMSL) on the west to 82 meters (270 feet) AMSL on the east. There is one retained slope near the start of the Union Station segment just north of U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101), but no others within or immediately adjacent to the proposed project area. The proposed project site is located within the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Region of California, characterized by east-west trending fault-block mountain ranges and basins in the south-central region of western California. The site is on the northern margin of the Los Angeles Coastal Plain within the river narrows and forebay area, where the river dissects the southern foothills of the east-west trending Santa Monica Mountains/Puente Hills ranges. The foothills, referred to in geologic references as Elysian Park and Repetto hills, are comprised predominately of Pliocene Fernando and Upper Miocene Puente marine sedimentary formations. The Transverse Ranges Region is also characterized by a series of northeast-southwest trending faults associated with the San Andreas Fault system.

3-8.1.3 Local Geology

Local geology of the site area consists of Quaternary alluvium associated with the river narrows and floodplain. The river plain is approximately 3.2 kilometers (2 miles) wide in the project area. The river is flanked on the east and west by terraces and low rolling hills (Elysian Park and Repetto hills) of the Puente and Fernando bedrock formations. Alluvial sediments consist primarily of river sand (generally well sorted, with little or no fines), with lenses of gravel and cobbles.

Underlying bedrock is moderately cemented siltstone of marine origin. According to California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 104, bedrock lies beneath alluvium at a depth of approximately 24 to 30 meters (80 to 100 feet). Union Station Oil Field is immediately south or west of proposed project components. Therefore, bedrock in the area could be petroliferous, exhibiting a natural oily stain and odor.

3-8.1.4 Soil Profile

Most, if not all, soils within the proposed project area have been modified and disturbed by grading and earthmoving associated with previous land uses. Therefore, it is unlikely that undisturbed native soils are present at the proposed project area. Available existing subsurface data were reviewed. The site consists of varying thickness of artificial fill underlain by mainly sands, with varying amounts of silts, gravels, and cobbles that overlie bedrock of marine origin. Occasional clays and silts were encountered within the previous borings. The fill and sands within the upper 1.6 to 9 meters (5 to 30 feet) were generally loose to dense. Below an approximate elevation of 79.2 meters (260 feet) AMSL the sands were dense to very dense along the project alignment, regardless of the existing ground elevation. Gravels and cobbles were also generally encountered below an elevation of 79.2 meters (260 feet) AMSL. Near the Burlington

Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) rail yard existing data were scarce, but increased gravels and cobbles should be anticipated because of its proximity to the Los Angeles River. Bedrock, where encountered, was competent.

The subsurface soils at the site are classified as Soil Profile 2, in accordance with the Manual of American Railway Engineering and Maintenance Way Association (AREMA) and as S_D to S_C in accordance with the Department's Seismic Design Criteria.

Due to the nature of past land use within the proposed project area, potential soil contamination may exist. Soil contamination is addressed in Section 3-9, Hazardous Materials.

3-8.1.5 Groundwater

Groundwater in the proposed project vicinity is present within alluvial sediments. Groundwater in the Los Angeles River floodplain is recharged from percolating precipitation, and from the river itself (where the river bed is not completely lined with concrete) flowing into Quaternary alluvial fan deposits (consisting mostly of sand). Urban development covers most land surface within the proposed project area with structures and pavement, limiting recharge from precipitation.

Groundwater was detected in previous borings at depths ranging from 7 to 14.6 meters (3 to 48 feet), with corresponding elevations ranging from 71.9 to 77.7 meters (236 to 255 feet) AMSL. Groundwater flows southward, generally parallel to the Los Angeles River. Given the coarse-grained texture of river sediments (i.e., sand, gravel, and cobbles), large water volumes could be released when alluvial deposits are penetrated. Groundwater quality in the project area is not specifically known, but may contain organic contaminants from solvent and petroleum hydrocarbon pollution associated with industrial activities in the area. Underlying bedrock is considered essentially nonwater bearing, but is likely saturated and may yield small quantities of poor quality water.

Historically high groundwater levels within the proposed project area ranges from 6 meters (20 feet) near Union Station to 16.7 meters (55 feet) near the southern part of the project area.

3-8.1.6 Mineral Resources

The proposed project area is immediately north and northeast of Union Station Oil Field. Union Station Oil Field was discovered in 1967. This field is represented by a generally east-west trending anticline, a structural feature (elongated dome) that traps petroleum and related compounds (i.e., crude oil and natural gas).

Surface locations of most wells (directionally drilled wells) are south of the proposed project area along Garvey Street, south of 1st Street. Since operating well sites are outside the proposed project site, recovery of natural resources would not be affected. It is not known if old abandoned wells or dry holes are located in the proposed project area.

3-8.1.7 Geologic Hazards

In the proposed project area, potential geologic hazards include seismic ground motion and associated ground failures. Seismic ground failures in the proposed project area may include liquefaction, lateral spreading, and ground oscillations. In addition, a very minor potential for regional subsidence may be associated with extracting oil and natural gas from Union Station Oil Field. Specific geologic hazards are discussed in the following sections.

a. Faulting

No mapped surface faults are reported through the project area. It should be noted that surface faults may exist that are not yet mapped. The proposed project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

b. Seismicity

The proposed project site is located within a seismically active region. The characteristics of nearby faults are summarized in Table 3-8.1. There is a potential for other faults to exist in the area.

| Table 3-8.1: Major Fault Characterization in the Project Vicinity | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|--|
| Fault | Approximate Distance (km)/(mile) | Type of Fault | Maximum Earthquake Magnitude (Mw) |
| Hollywood | 5.8 | Reverse oblique | 6.4 |
| Raymond | 5.2/3.3 | Reverse oblique | 6.5 |
| Elysian Park Thrust | 6.5/4.0 | Reverse | 6.7 |
| Newport-Inglewood (L.A. Basin) | 7.3/4.5 | Strike slip | 6.9 |
| San Jacinto | 7.3/4.5 | Reverse oblique | 6.7 |
| Compton Thrust | 8.9/5.5 | Reverse blind thrust | 6.8 |
| Santa Monica | 10.5/6.5 | Reverse oblique | 6.6 |
| Sierra Madre | 11.7/7.3 | Reverse | 7.0 |

Source: Diaz-Yourman & Associates 2003.

A probabilistic seismic hazard evaluation was performed for the proposed site using the computer program FRISK (Blake 2000). The peak horizontal ground acceleration and return period relationship for the proposed project site is shown on Figure 3-8.1. The horizontal peak bedrock acceleration for the proposed site was estimated to be approximately 0.6g, according to a Department California seismic hazard map.

c. Liquefaction Potential and Related Ground Failures

Liquefaction occurs when saturated, cohesionless (low relative density) materials (usually sand or silty sand) are transformed from a solid to a near-liquid state. This phenomenon occurs when moderate to severe seismic groundshaking causes pore-water pressure to increase. Site susceptibility to liquefaction is a function of the depth, density, and water content of granular sediments, along with the magnitude and frequency of earthquakes in the surrounding region. Saturated, unconsolidated silts, sands, and silty sands within 50 feet (15.2 meters) of the ground surface are most susceptible to liquefaction. Liquefaction-related phenomena include lateral spreading, ground oscillation, flow failures, loss of bearing strength, subsidence, and buoyancy effects.

The expected level of groundshaking in the proposed project area is high enough to initiate liquefaction. In addition to high seismic shaking levels, the two other key conditions conducive to liquefaction—shallow groundwater and cohesionless sands—are potentially present within the proposed project area. The proposed project area is partially located within the potential liquefaction zones on the State of California seismic hazard zone maps. Lateral spreading can occur on relatively shallow slopes.


Liquefaction of shallow layers causes a loss of shear strength, allowing the surface to move laterally across gentle slopes. Areas with lateral spreading potential would most likely be adjacent to drainages where slopes are steepest and water may be more likely to accumulate (predominantly east of the proposed project area, adjacent to the Los Angeles River). It is not possible to map specific areas prone to lateral spreading based on the current data available for this study. However, based on liquefaction potential areas of the proposed project adjacent to the Los Angeles River, this hazard may be present in the site area.

Liquefaction analyses were performed using procedures presented in the 1997 National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research guidelines for peak ground acceleration of 0.6g, as estimated from Department seismic hazard maps. Analyses performed using a design groundwater depth of 6 meters (20 feet) based on the historical high groundwater depth and available blow counts indicated that the majority of the site soils have low potential for liquefaction. For preliminary design, the liquefaction potential of the site soils may be assumed to be low. Additional investigation during final design is required to confirm the assumption.

d. Landslides

Slope instability is related to slope gradient, soil or rock type, consolidation or cementation of the rock, and the amount of fracturing of the rock. Land sliding can be seismically induced, resulting from extended periods of groundshaking and high ground accelerations. Improper grading and excessive rainfall or irrigation can also increase the susceptibility of land sliding. Generally, slopes of 10 degrees or more are subject to seismically induced land sliding. Slopes onsite and nearby are nearly flat (0.5-degree slope).

The proposed project site is nearly flat, and is not adjacent to any hills or steep slopes. Therefore, the probability of landslide onsite or affecting the project site is unlikely.



Source: Diaz Yourman & Associates, 2003.

Figure 3-8.1: Acceleration Coefficient vs. Earthquake Return Period

d. Tsunami

The proposed project site is not located along or within 16 kilometers (10 miles) of the coastline. As a result, it is improbable that the site will be affected by tsunamis.

e. Subsidence and Settlement

Subsidence is the gradual downward settling of the land surface, with little or no horizontal movement. It is caused by many different factors. Extracting large fluid volumes (i.e., water, oil, and gas) from thick layers of poorly consolidated sediments is a principal cause of surface subsidence. Since the thickness of alluvial sediments in the area is limited by shallow bedrock, and no major groundwater production fields are located within or nearby the proposed project area, the potential for surface subsidence associated with groundwater extraction is limited.

The proposed project area is immediately north and northeast of Union Station Oil Field (see discussion below). Producing zones range in depth from more than 1,067 meters (3,500 feet) to more than 2,134 meters (7,000 feet) below surface. Although some minor surface subsidence related to oil extraction may have occurred, its distribution across a broad area is likely to have limited its potential effects, and no known substantial effects are documented. Similarly, the potential for future substantial surface subsidence effects from oil extraction is very low.

Structures can settle due to consolidation of clay- or silt-rich sediments that have not been buried by other geologic deposits, or that have not undergone hydroconsolidation (addition of water into the soil structure). Expansion and contraction of clay-rich sediments can also cause soil displacements. Specific quantitative conditions by geologic or soil unit were not determined for this study. Any low-density, loose deposits present would be removed before construction or bypassed (penetrated by deeper foundations or piles) for new structures.

f. Shallow Subsurface Gas

Subsurface gases of concern in the proposed project vicinity are methane and hydrogen sulfide. Methane is a naturally occurring flammable substance commonly associated with crude oil accumulations. It is the primary component in natural gas used for both domestic and industrial applications. When present in shallow subsurface geologic units, potential hazards exist. Underground structures, such as basements and subterranean parking garages, are susceptible to gas seepage in potential methane hazard areas. Methane is a light gas that disperses in the atmosphere when unconfined. If methane is trapped and accumulates inside structures, it creates a risk of fire and explosion.

Hydrogen sulfide gas (H₂S) is also associated with crude oil deposits. H₂S is hazardous and toxic at very low concentrations, and is heavier than air. Therefore, it accumulates inside lower level structures, such as basements. With a strong “rotten egg” odor, trace amount are a nuisance. At moderately low concentrations, inhalation of H₂S creates health risks or even causes death.

An irregularly shaped area of known shallow methane accumulation is delineated for much of downtown Los Angeles. This area is primarily west of the proposed project area. Generally, methane area boundaries are U.S. 101 and Interstate Route 110 on the north and west (respectively), Olympic Boulevard on the south, and Los Angeles Street on the east.

Testing for shallow subsurface gases was conducted along a subway corridor previously proposed for the MTA Eastside LRT Project. Numerous monitoring wells and probes were installed along this corridor to collect and analyze shallow subsurface gases. Several of these wells and probes detected hydrogen sulfide and methane gases in the industrial area between 1st Street and U.S. 101 and west of the Los Angeles River. Subsurface gases collected from probes at these locations indicate low concentrations of methane (1,700 parts per million [ppm]), in one location. The lower explosive limit for methane is 50,000 ppm. All other locations were below 100 ppm. No H₂S has been measured in the borings for the 1st Street alignment to date. Since these test locations are on the northern flank of the structure forming Union Station Oil Field, beyond the productive field outline, subsurface gas concentrations reported may not be fully representative of actual conditions within the proposed project area.

g. Abandoned Wells and Dry Holes

Los Angeles has a long history of oil and gas development. The first wells in the downtown area were drilled in the late 1800s. Not all attempts to find commercial crude oil reserves were successful. Wells that were not economical (e.g., limited reserves or wet) were plugged and abandoned. Unsuccessful exploratory holes were abandoned as “dry holes.” Not all wells and dry holes were documented during the early development of Los Angeles.

Abandoned wells and dry holes represent potential hazards for nearby buildings and occupants. Prior to regulations, many early wells and dry holes were plugged with telephone poles, railroad ties, or other debris before being buried. These holes represent potential vertical migration pathways for crude oil, methane, H₂S, and other compounds. It is not known if any abandoned wells or dry holes are present in or immediately adjacent to the proposed project area. Although existence of abandoned wells or dry holes within the proposed project boundaries is remote, the possibility cannot be fully discounted.

3-8.2 Environmental Impacts

Potential environmental impacts were analyzed and evaluated using the methodology summarized below. Environmental impacts for geology, seismicity, and soils would be substantially similar for both Alternatives A and A-1 under consideration. No new geology, seismic, or soil impacts are associated with the No Build Alternative.

3-8.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Existing conditions in the proposed project area were evaluated in accordance with the impact criteria listed below. Impacts considered either adverse (under NEPA) or significant (under CEQA) are indicated below. Specific mitigation measures are provided for these adverse or significant impacts.

3-8.2.2 Impact Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR/EIS, and in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would have an adverse (under NEPA) or significant (under CEQA) effect on the environment if it would:

- Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic groundshaking, seismically induced ground failure or liquefaction, seismically induced flooding, or landslides or other slope failure.
- Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property.
- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
- Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

3-8.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, existing conditions along proposed run-through tracks alignments would remain the same. No alterations affecting geology would occur and no new facilities would be exposed to potential geologic hazards. Therefore, no adverse impacts (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) would result from the No Build Alternative. Other transportation projects included in the No Build Alternative are not expected to have impacts affecting geology during construction since each would be implemented in accordance with federal, state, and local engineering standards that address specific conditions in the area.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Both Alternatives A and A-1 include construction of retaining walls, placement of artificial fill, and installation of deep pile foundations for structural support. Excavation for retaining wall foundations would occur in the BNSF yard, and drilling for pile installations would take place along the proposed alignment. Construction specifications would comply with federal, state, and local standards related to geology so that potential construction-period impacts would be less than significant.

Unstable Slopes

Excavation depth for retaining wall foundation would be shallow. Appropriate shoring would be implemented as required. Therefore, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) slope stability impacts are anticipated for retaining wall foundation excavations.

Drilling for pile installation may encounter unstable materials. If caving soils were encountered, temporary casing or drill mud would be used to stabilize the borehole during construction. Therefore, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) slope stability impacts are anticipated for pile foundation excavations.

Specific fill design and dimensions have not been determined. The new fills would be retained by retaining walls. Since it is assumed that the retaining walls would be designed to be stable, in accordance with appropriate engineering standards, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) slope stability impacts would be associated with fill placement.

Accelerated Erosion

Grading and excavation activities during construction would expose soils on the project site to possible wind and water erosion. Implementing industry standard stormwater pollution control best management practices (BMPs) would reduce soil erosion to a less-than-significant or -adverse level. Erosion control measures that would be implemented as part of BMPs would include the placement of sandbags around basins, use of proper grading techniques, appropriate sloping, construction site shoring, and bracing, as appropriate, and covering or stabilizing topsoil stockpiles. The construction industry standard stormwater BMPs that would be followed are provided in the State of California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook, Construction Activity.

Shallow Groundwater

Borings for deep piles may encounter shallow groundwater. This shallow groundwater may contain organic contaminants. If dewatering is required for construction, a potentially significant or adverse impact may result. Construction worker health and safety issues associated with contaminated groundwater are evaluated and discussed under Section 3-9, Hazardous Materials.

Contaminated Soils

Excavations for foundation footings and piles may encounter contaminated soils. If contaminated soils were present within the proposed project site, a potentially significant or adverse impact would result. Construction worker health and safety issues associated with soil contamination are evaluated and discussed Section 3-9, Hazardous Materials.

Shallow Subsurface Gas

Excavations for foundation footings and piles may encounter shallow subsurface gas (primarily methane, but may also include some H₂S). If shallow subsurface gas were present within the

proposed project site, a potentially significant or adverse impact would result. Construction worker health and safety issues associated with shallow subsurface gases are evaluated and discussed under Section 3-9, Hazardous Materials.

Undocumented Abandoned Oil Wells and Dry Holes

No documented abandoned oil wells or dry holes are identified within the proposed project area. If undocumented abandoned oil wells or dry holes are encountered during excavation or grading activities, a significant or adverse impact would result. Discovery of undocumented wells or dry holes during construction activities would be reported, as required, to the City of Los Angeles and the California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR). Any uncovered wells or dry holes would be plugged and abandoned in accordance with current DOGGR regulations.

3-8.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Since the No Build Alternative does not include construction of the run-through tracks, long-term impacts would not result. Other transportation projects in the area are not expected to have long-term impacts since they would be constructed in compliance with federal, state, and local geological requirements.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Long-term impacts for Alternative A are associated with seismic ground motion.

Strong Ground Motion

The ground motion hazard is not unusual for the Los Angeles area. The estimated peak ground acceleration at the project site from a deterministic evaluation is 0.6g. Peak ground acceleration for various design-level earthquakes, in accordance with AREMA, may be estimated from Figure 3-8.1. Since it is assumed that design and construction of the proposed project conforms to all applicable codes, potential ground motion impacts would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading

A portion of the proposed project site is within a liquefaction hazard zone defined as part of the California Geological Survey Seismic Hazards Mapping Program. Artificial fill is present at the surface. Based on an initial assessment, the majority of the alluvium underlying the artificial fill has low potential for liquefaction. Additionally, deep pile foundations that extend below potential liquefaction zones will be used for structural support. Therefore, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) liquefaction impacts associated with deep foundations are anticipated.

Due to the potential for shallow liquefaction adjacent to the Los Angeles River, lateral spreading impacts are possible for the BNSF area and the Mail Service Segment. If liquefaction-induced lateral spreading were to occur, impacts would be significant or adverse. Project final design would fully evaluate the potential for liquefaction and its effects. Since it is assumed that final design investigations, design, and construction of the proposed project would conform to all applicable codes, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) potential lateral spreading impacts are anticipated.

Settlement and Subsidence

Placement of new artificial fill material and construction of new retaining walls, as well as operational loads caused by trains, would increase loads placed on existing underlying earth materials. Preliminary estimates of settlement and additional pressures due to new fill have been made. Project final design would fully evaluate these loads. Settlement or subsidence caused by additional loads represents a potential adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact, especially if it affects surrounding structures. The effects of new fill can be reduced by use of lightweight fill material such that no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would occur.

3-8.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

There should be no cumulative significant/adverse geologic or seismic impacts. Potential impacts of the proposed project would not affect any other proposed projects in the area. It is assumed that proper design of any project in the area in accordance with engineering standards would mitigate the impacts of strong groundshaking, liquefaction potential, and earthquake-induced subsidence.

3-8.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternatives A and A-1 would be constructed in accordance with the following regulations.

Slope Stability

All earthwork and grading must comply with State of California codes. All excavation and shoring systems would meet the minimum requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards. With implementation of these requirements, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) slope stability impacts are anticipated.

Erosion Control

Erosion control during site construction is regulated and requires application of BMPs. Construction industry standard storm \water BMPs are provided in the State of California Storm

Water Best Management Practice Handbook, Construction Activity. With application of BMPs, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) erosion impacts are expected.

Contaminated Groundwater or Soil

If contaminated groundwater or soils are encountered at the site, they must be handled in accordance with state and federal regulations. These potential impacts are discussed under Section 3-9, Hazardous Materials.

Shallow Gas

OSHA regulations cover potential worker exposure to subsurface gases during construction. Potential impacts associated with subsurface gas exposure are discussed under Section 3-9, Hazardous Materials.

Undocumented Wells and Dry Holes

The City of Los Angeles and DOGGR regulate construction activities over or near abandoned wells and dry holes. Wells and dry holes under or in close proximity to construction must be plugged and abandoned in accordance with current DOGGR regulations. By conforming to existing state and city requirements, adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts associated with abandoned wells or dry holes are not anticipated.

b. Long Term

Alternatives A and A-1

Existing codes govern design and construction in seismically active areas such as Los Angeles. By complying with all applicable codes, potential ground motion and liquefaction hazards would not represent adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts.

3-8.3 Potential Mitigation

3-8.3.1 Construction Period

Potential construction impacts related to geology and geologic hazards for Alternatives A and A-1 would be mitigated by existing regulations. No additional construction mitigation measures are proposed.

3-8.3.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

Compliance with existing regulations would mitigate long-term impacts, except for settlement and subsidence. To address these issues, the following measure will be implemented.

GE-1 During final design, project design will evaluate potential subsidence or settlement caused by additional loads from fill and retaining walls, especially when trains are present. Final project design will ensure that site subsidence or settlement does not result in impacts to adjacent structures. In order to evaluate these issues, a final geotechnical report shall be prepared before final design of proposed structures, and recommendations provided in this report shall be implemented, as appropriate.

3-8.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-8.4.1 Construction Period

Following implementation of regulatory compliance requirements, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts were identified for Alternatives A or A-1. No additional mitigation measures are proposed.

3-8.4.2 Long Term

Following implementation of regulatory compliance requirements and proposed Mitigation Measure GE-1, impacts for either Alternatives A or A-1 would be not adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA).

3-7 EXECUTIVE ORDERS

This section briefly summarizes the requirements of certain federal executive orders applicable to the proposed project. As indicated in the cross-references cited below, documentation of how the proposed project complies with each executive order is provided in various sections of Chapter 3.

Because the proposed project has a federal component, it must comply with federal executive orders. Since the executive orders evaluation is required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and not by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), only the NEPA term “adverse” is used to describe impacts. The CEQA term “significant” does not apply and therefore is not used in this section.

3-7.1 FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, signed on May 24, 1977, requires that federal agencies “avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. . .” within the 100-year flood elevation. Federal agencies that propose to construct projects in floodplain areas must consider alternatives that will avoid adverse effects and incompatible development. If the proposed project is to be located in a floodplain, the federal agency shall take action to modify the project in a way that minimizes potential harm. As described in Section 3-18, Hydrology and Water Quality, neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would affect floodplains. Therefore, the proposed project does not conflict with Executive Order 11988.

3-7.2 PROTECTION OF WETLANDS

Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, signed on May 24, 1977, requires that federal agencies “avoid to the extent possible the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative . . .” Federal agencies must avoid constructing proposed projects in wetland areas unless the head of the agency determines that there are no practicable alternatives to such construction and that the proposed project includes measures that will minimize any harm to wetlands. The proposed project is not in an area with any wetlands and therefore does not conflict with Executive Order 11990.

3-7.3 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations, signed on February 11, 1994, directs that “each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. . .” The

fundamental principles underlying environmental justice assessment are: (1) to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority and low-income populations; (2) to ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and (3) to prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations. Section 3-14, Population, Housing, and Employment, reports that no disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations would result from construction or operation of the proposed project. Chapter 5 reports the public outreach effort that was made to communities surrounding the proposed project. These communities do include minority and low-income populations.

3-7.4 INVASIVE SPECIES

Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species, signed on February 3, 1999, requires that a federal agency “not authorize, fund, or carry out actions that it believes are likely to cause or promote the introduction or spread of invasive species in the United States or elsewhere unless, pursuant to guidelines it has prescribed, the agency has determined and made public its determination that the benefits of such actions clearly outweigh the potential harm caused by invasive species; and that all feasible and prudent measures to minimize risk of harm will be taken in conjunction with the actions.” The primary purpose of this directive is to reduce the ecological and economic effects of invasive plant and animal species to agriculture, industry, recreation, and the environment. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project includes any activities that would introduce or spread invasive species. Therefore, the project is not in conflict with Executive Order 13112.

3-6 ENERGY

3-6.1 Existing Conditions

3-6.1.1 Regulatory Framework

a. Federal

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) was created through the Department of Energy Organization Act on October 1, 1977, and assumed the responsibilities of its predecessor, the Federal Power Commission. FERC's legal authority comes from the Federal Power Act of 1935, the Natural Gas Act of 1938, the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978, the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, and the Energy Policy Act of 1992. FERC is an independent regulatory agency within the U.S. Department of Energy that:

- Regulates the transmission and sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce
- Regulates the transmission of oil by pipeline in interstate commerce
- Regulates the transmission and wholesale sale of electricity in interstate commerce
- Licenses and inspects private, municipal, and state hydroelectric projects
- Oversees environmental matters related to natural gas, oil, electricity, and hydroelectric projects
- Administers accounting and financial reporting regulations and conduct of jurisdictional companies
- Approves site choices, as well as abandonment of interstate pipeline facilities.

b. State

California Public Utility Commission

The California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) regulates privately owned electric, telecommunications, natural gas, water, and transportation companies, rail safety, and movers of household goods. CPUC's Energy Division works to set electric rates, protect consumers, and promote energy efficiency, electric system reliability, and utility financial integrity. CPUC regulates natural gas local distribution facilities and services, natural gas procurement, intrastate pipelines, and intrastate production and gathering. It works to provide opportunities for competition when in the interest of consumers, takes the lead in environmental review of natural

gas-related projects, recognizes the growing interaction of electric and gas markets, and monitors gas energy efficiency and other public purpose programs.

California Energy Commission

The California Energy Commission (CEC) was established to address the energy challenges facing the state and the importance of energy conservation. CEC is the state's principal energy policy and planning organization. The commission has five major responsibilities: (1) forecasting future energy needs and maintaining historical energy data, (2) licensing 50 megawatt or larger thermal power plants, (3) promoting energy efficiency through appliance and building standards, (4) developing energy technologies and supporting renewable energy, and (5) planning for and directing state response to energy emergencies. CEC has been directed by the state legislature to direct energy research programs and renewable energy programs in the wake of electricity industry restructuring or deregulation.

3-6.1.2 Environmental Setting

Energy exists in several forms, although most of the world's energy comes from fossil fuel, which is burned to produce heat. One form of energy is converted to another form for public use (e.g., coal is burned to produce steam, which drive turbines to produce electricity). Energy is measured in terms of work capability. Electric energy is measured in kilowatt-hours, where a kilowatt is a measure of power or heat flow rate. Natural gas is measured in British thermal units (Btu), which is the quantity of heat needed to raise the temperature of 1 pound of water by 1 degree Fahrenheit. A kilowatt-hour is equivalent to 3,413 Btu. California is dependent upon three major forms of energy: petroleum fuels, natural gas, and electricity. Energy service requirements are related to the size and type of project and the geographic area served. New projects or the expansion of existing uses may increase energy consumption and affect the energy distribution infrastructure.

a. Petroleum Fuels

The major categories of petroleum fuels are gasoline and diesel for passenger vehicles, transit, and rail vehicles, and fuel oils for industry and electrical power generation. Other liquid fuels include kerosene for jets. In 2001, approximately 50% of petroleum fuels were supplied from California, followed by 30% from foreign sources and 20% from Alaska. Petroleum fuel can produce from 125,000 to 150,000 Btu per gallon.

The predominant use of petroleum in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region is for transportation. Based on the SCAG 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), in 1997 the SCAG region consumed 63,17,050 liters (16,687,890 gallons) per day of petroleum fuel, including gasoline and diesel fuel for light-, medium-, and heavy-duty on-road vehicles. This fuel was consumed in driving 557,304,000 vehicle kilometers (346,292,865 vehicle miles) per day. SCAG's 2001 RTP projects vehicle miles traveled and associated petroleum fuel usage for 2025. Despite the spread of alternative fuels, petroleum usage in the SCAG region for light-, medium-, and heavy-duty vehicles is expected to continue to grow by 35% to 40% by 2025, roughly keeping pace with population growth and increases in vehicle

miles traveled. The state is currently at 95% of its petroleum refining capacity, but CEC still projects an essentially stable price for gasoline for about the next 20 years.

b. Natural Gas

Although natural gas is usually produced in conjunction with oil, the primary source for natural gas in California is not associated with California oil supplies. Approximately 50% of the state's natural gas is from the Southwest. The remaining portions are supplied by Canada (25%), the Rocky Mountains (10%), and in-state sources, which accounted for approximately 15% of California's natural gas supply. The Southern California Gas Company, a subsidiary of Sempra Energy, provides natural gas to the City of Los Angeles. As the nation's largest natural gas distribution utility, the Southern California Gas Company serves 18.9 million people through 5 million gas meters in more than 530 communities. Its service area encompasses 23,000 square miles of Central and Southern California. In the SCAG region, natural gas consumption in 2000 was approximately 2,100 million cubic feet per day. SCAG's 2002 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, Energy, forecasts the demand growth for natural gas in the SCAG region to increase 11% in the next 10 to 20 years. Natural gas companies plan to supply Southern California's future natural gas needs by creating a new gas terminal and pipeline infrastructure in northern Baja California.

c. Electricity

The production of electricity requires the consumption of other energy resources, including water, wind, oil, gas, coal, solar, geothermal, and nuclear. Most of these resources are used as heat sources for steam turbines that drive electric generators. The electricity generated is distributed via a network or transmission and distribution lines commonly known as a power grid. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides electricity to the City of Los Angeles. Currently, 20% of annual generation needs is provided by the LADWP basin gas generation facilities, which utilized 57 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 2001.

From 1999 to 2000, 1.4 million customers served by LADWP consumed approximately 22.5 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. The largest number of customers is residential; however, commercial and industrial customers consume about 70% of the electricity. The average annual number of kilowatt-hours per residential customer was 5,238 in 2000. The total forecasted energy demand in the LADWP service area is 26,730 gigawatt hours in 2003, 28,250 gigawatt hours in 2010, and 30,186 gigawatt hours in 2015 (CEC 1996), based on an average annual growth rate of 1.4%.

3-6.2 Environmental Impacts

Energy consumption associated with the proposed project would result from short-term construction, long-term operations, and increased rail activity. During construction, short-term energy consumption would primarily result from use of petroleum fuels by construction equipment for demolition, grading, site preparation, and excavation, as well as worker trips. Long-term energy consumption would result from lighting, heating, and cooling of station facilities, operation of rail signals and track equipment, and other operational needs of Union

Station and its associated rail and track facilities. Potential energy savings could occur from a decrease in fuel consumption and passenger vehicle trips resulting from a modal switch of driving cars to riding trains.

3-6.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Potential impacts to energy resources were evaluated in terms of:

- Increase in energy demand by the project
- Demand for additional energy supply and distribution systems required by the project
- Energy conservation features
- If new infrastructure is required, whether it is anticipated in adopted plans for the project area.

3-6.2.2 Impact Criteria

Only NEPA criteria apply for impacts to energy resources. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) requires assessment of potential environmental impacts on production and consumption of energy. Per the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (2002), an environmental impact statement (EIS) shall assess in detail any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of energy resources likely to be involved in each alternative and any potential energy conservation, especially those alternatives likely to reduce the use of petroleum or natural gas, consistent with the policy outlined in Executive Order 12185. Accordingly, for this study, the following significance thresholds, derived from CEQA questions about energy impacts, are used for determining significance under NEPA.

A significant impact would occur if the project:

- Results in a substantial increase in the use of fuel or energy
- Results in a substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resource
- Results in the substantial depletion of any nonrenewable resource.

3-6.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

With the No Build Alternative, the proposed station improvements and run-through tracks would not be built. No short-term consumption of energy or additional fuel for worker vehicles and construction equipment for the proposed project would result since no construction would occur. Short-term consumption for other transportation projects that would occur as part of the No Build Alternative is not expected to create a substantial demand on regional fuel supplies.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

During construction of the proposed project, gasoline and diesel fuel would be consumed by construction equipment and trucks and by construction workers commuting in vehicles to and from the work site over an approximately 2-year construction period. It is estimated that approximately 200,000 gallons of both gasoline and diesel fuel would be consumed.¹ Recent SCAG forecasts have estimated that 23,653,149 million gallons per year would be consumed in the region by 2025. The fuel used during construction would be 0.1% of total fuel consumed in the SCAG region and would not have an adverse impact (under NEPA) on regional supplies. Some minor amounts of natural gas and electricity would also be consumed. No new infrastructure to produce or deliver petroleum fuel to the area would be required. Given the adequacy of current energy supplies, the incremental and temporary increases in fuel and energy consumption are not considered adverse (under NEPA).

There may be some temporary disruptions of utility (particularly gas and electrical) service in the immediate area in order to install new utility connections or reroute utility lines (see Section 3-16, Utility Disruptions and Relocations). However, any disruptions, if they occur, would be temporary, and efforts would be made to avoid or minimize potential disruption of service. Consequently, utility disruption is not expected to be adverse (under NEPA).

3-6.2.4 Long-term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

With the No Build Alternative, the proposed station improvements and run-through tracks would not be built. Electricity and gas would continue to be consumed for station operations. Projected supplies of electricity and gas are expected to be adequate to accommodate until 2010 current and future operations at the station. Fuel consumption associated with train and vehicle transportation would continue. Any decrease in fuel consumption that may be associated with the percentage of automobile drivers switching to using rail would not occur. Other transportation projects included in the No Build Alternative are not expected to have long-term impacts on energy supplies. The project with the greatest potential energy demand is the MTA Eastside LRT Extension. That project's environmental document did not indicate a long-term impact.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

For either of the Build Alternatives, operation of the Union Station improvements would result in the additional consumption of approximately 4,612 kilowatt-hours of electricity per day (1,683,500 kilowatt-hours per year); and approximately 8,548 cubic feet of natural gas per day

¹ Assumes 0.19 gallon per square foot of development. Source: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Headquarters Facility Project EIR 1995.

(3,120,000 cubic feet per year) for station operations.² No substantial additional demand for electricity and gas would be generated. This additional demand would not require new infrastructure to produce or deliver electricity and gas to the region.

From 2010 to 2023, operation of the proposed improvements would also realize fuel savings by the reduction of motor vehicle trips due to the project. Based on an estimated ridership of 258 passengers per train (SCRRA 2003), the 53 future trains that would be accommodated by the station improvements would serve an additional 13,674 passengers in 2025. Assuming an average commute trip to Los Angeles of 32 miles per one-way trip and a diesel fuel consumption rate of 2.47 gallons per mile, the additional trains would consume 9,164 gallons of petroleum fuel per day. This would be offset by a reduction of vehicle trips that these passengers would have otherwise generated by commuting to and from Los Angeles via other modes of transportation (i.e., autos and buses). Assuming a modal split that distributes a portion of the passengers to transit (buses), the total number of vehicle (autos and buses) trips that would be reduced by implementation of the project would be 11,189 one-way trips. Assuming a fuel consumption of one gallon per 20.8 miles (SCAG 1999), the reduction in vehicle trips with implementation of the project would result in a saving of 34,428 gallons per day of petroleum fuel.

3-6.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the related projects in conjunction with the proposed project would also result in additional consumption of energy, including electricity, natural gas, and petroleum fuels. Additional demand during construction would be short term. Operation of the related transportation projects would not result in a substantial demand for additional energy or require new energy production or delivery facilities.

3-6.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternatives A and A-1

Energy savings, primarily in petroleum fuels, may be realized through regular maintenance of construction vehicles and equipment, which improves fuel efficiency. Requirements for implementation of regular equipment maintenance are typically contained in Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (required under Clean Water Act Section 402) best management practices.

² South Coast Air Quality Management District. April 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Table A9-11-A and Table A9-12-A. Assumes rates for Offices.

b. Long Term

Alternatives A and A-1

The proposed project would incorporate energy conservation features in the design of the station modifications and track control and signal systems that could comply with applicable codes and regulations. No adverse (under NEPA) impacts to energy resources during operation of the improved facilities would result for Alternatives A or A-1.

3-6.3 Potential Mitigation

3-6.3.1 Construction Period

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No mitigation is required. No adverse (under NEPA) impacts to energy resources are expected to occur during construction of Alternatives A or A-1.

3-6.3.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No mitigation is required. No adverse (under NEPA) impacts to energy resources are expected to occur during operation of Alternatives A or A-1.

3-6.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-6.4.1 Construction Period

No mitigation is required for either Build Alternative. No adverse (under NEPA) impacts to energy resources are expected to occur during construction of Alternatives A or A-1.

3-6.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No mitigation is required for either Build Alternative. No adverse (NEPA) impacts to energy resources are expected to occur during operation of Alternatives A or A-1.

3-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3-5.1 Existing Conditions

3-5.1.1 Regulatory Framework

a. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that federal agencies integrate the NEPA process with other environmental laws. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended (Section 106, 16 U.S.C. 470f) requires that impacts on significant cultural resources, hereafter called historic properties, be taken into consideration in any federal undertaking. “Historic property means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that meet the National Register criteria” [36 CFR §800.16(l)].

Cultural resources studies for the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project are subject to the procedures of and review of the Department and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) in consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). These studies are shaped by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) regulations (36 CFR Part 800) for implementing Section 106. Section 106 studies provide the information necessary to satisfy legal requirements for environmental documents under NEPA. The Department acts as a coordinator in the Section 106 process, but the final responsibility to carry out this regulation belongs to FRA, the designated lead federal agency.

b. California Environmental Quality Act

According to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1), historical resources include any resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). Properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register, such as those identified in the Section 106 process, are automatically listed in the California Register. Therefore, all “historic properties” under federal preservation law are automatically “historical resources” under state preservation law. Historical resources are also presumed to be significant if they are included in a local register of historical resources (e.g., City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments) or identified as significant in a qualified historical resource survey. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines sets forth the criteria and procedures for determining significant historical resources, and the potential effects of a project on such resources.

CEQA also categorizes paleontological resources as cultural resources and requires an impact evaluation to such resources. Impacts to paleontological resources fall under CEQA only and are not considered resources to be evaluated under NEPA or the Section 106 process.

3-5.1.2 Compliance Methodology

The following cultural resources sections summarize the Section 106 and CEQA process and determinations, to date, and are subject to change following SHPO review and concurrence. Details may be found in the Section 106 technical documents that have been submitted to the SHPO and other consulting parties, and are also available for public review with other technical reports prepared for this EIR/EIS. The cultural resources technical documents were prepared in accordance with the Department Environmental Handbook (Volume 2) Cultural Resources (Draft July 2001), and include the Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR), Archaeological Survey Report (ASR), and Historical Resource Evaluation Report (HRER).

Section 106 regulations prescribe the following steps, which are described in this and subsequent sections:

- determine and document the area of potential effects
- identify consulting parties
- identify potential historic properties
- evaluate historic significance of properties by applying National Register eligibility criteria in consultation with SHPO or Indian tribes, as appropriate
- assess effects on historic properties by applying ACHP criteria of adverse effects
- develop avoidance and mitigation measures if necessary
- document the process

These steps are adequate to comply with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines, because the Section 106 guidelines have more rigorous review requirements. For example, CEQA does not require careful delineation of a study area such as the area of potential effects, and does not require consultation with the SHPO.

For the proposed project, no properties were identified that meet California Register criteria but do not meet National Register criteria. Therefore, there is no difference between the compliance methodology for “historic properties” under federal law and “historical resources” under state law. For the purposes of this environmental document, the term “historic properties” will hereafter be used to represent both the federal term “historic properties” and state term “historical resources,” unless otherwise appropriate.

a. The Area of Potential Effects

As defined in the Section 106 regulations, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) means “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects cause by the undertaking” [36 CFR §800.16(d)]. While the CEQA Guidelines do not require delineation of an analogous study area, the APE does take into account all properties with historical resources that may be significantly affected by the project.

Definition

On July 11, 2002, the Department, on behalf of FRA, consulted with the SHPO to determine and document the preliminary APE on an aerial base map. The APE definition for the proposed project is as follows:

The APE for archaeological resources includes any ground area that would be disturbed by excavation, grading, construction, demolition, staging, utility relocation, or railroad track reconfiguration. The APE for architectural and historical resources includes the parcels encompassing the archaeological APE and any nearby parcels containing resources sensitive to permanent visual effects or to noise and vibration effects. North of Union Station, the APE follows the railroad right-of-way until joining tracks east of Mission Junction.

At the time the APE was defined, there were six potential alternative alignments in the area south of U.S. 101 and north of 1st Street. These six potential alignments were subsequently reduced to two (A and A-1) that are the focus of this EIR/EIS. The APE boundary, shown on Figure 3-5.1 and Figure 3-5.2, was based on an application of the above definition to the conceptual engineering available for six possible build alternatives identified in the Alternatives Analysis process. The APE boundary depicts a worst case affected area, by encompassing all six potential build alternative APEs (and thus includes Alternatives A and A-1 which resulted from the Alternatives Analysis process). There is no APE for the No-Build Alternative, because any existing effects on historic properties would remain unchanged. The APE was amended to include the proposed site for the relocated Amtrak mail transfer facility operations to be constructed near Washington Boulevard and 15th Street. The APE boundary was presented to SHPO in a meeting on December 12, 2002, and the SHPO concurred with its delineation and adequacy in a letter dated January 15, 2004.

Potential historic resources in the APE are discussed below in Section 3-5.1.4

Historic Properties Near, but Outside the APE

The following properties that are listed in, or appear eligible for, the National Register, are located in the vicinity of the proposed project, but would not be affected by it.




Figure 3-5.1: Area of Potential Effects Map

Sources: City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2002-2003.



**Los Angeles Union Station Run - Through Project
Area of Potential Effects Addendum Map for the
Mail Transfer Facility**



Map 3a

Area of Potential Effects Addendum
Los Angeles Union Station Project
Los Angeles County, California
Caltrans No. (PM) 07-LA-101-KP 0.89
EA 633034

Sources: City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2002-2003.

Figure 3-5.2: APE Addendum

□ **El Pueblo**

El Pueblo de Los Angeles (El Pueblo) (the extant portion of the founding settlement of the City of Los Angeles), located to the west of Union Station across Alameda Street, is a historic district of 19th-century resources. El Pueblo was listed in the National Register on November 3, 1972, is a State of California Historic Park, and contains two City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments, and seven California Historical Landmarks. The LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project site is located across Alameda Street and more than 800 feet (243.8 meters) southeast of El Pueblo. El Pueblo is buffered from the proposed project by Alameda Street and the Union Station Terminal building, and is therefore outside of the APE for this project.

□ **Terminal Annex**

U.S. Postal Service Terminal Annex (Terminal Annex), located at 900 N. Alameda Street, was listed in the National Register on January 11, 1985. Terminal Annex is located north of the main portion of the Union Station complex, across Cesar E. Chavez Avenue (formerly Macy Street). It is located on a separate parcel to the west of the Throat area, which is where existing railroad tracks to Union Station would undergo minor reconfiguration. The reconfiguration would not affect the character-defining features of the Terminal Annex. Since there are no effects and due to the distance about 500 feet (152 meters) between the building and the track, the Terminal Annex is outside the APE.

□ **General Electric Building**

The General Electric Building was designed by Albert C. Martin and constructed in 1937. The three-story, reinforced concrete Moderne style building appears eligible for the National Register under Criterion C because it was designed by a master architect. It was one of several General Electric buildings in the Los Angeles area; this one served as a sales office and general warehouse. In 1991, the City of Los Angeles acquired the building. The Department of Public Works, Architectural Division implemented plans for the adaptive reuse of the building as the City of Los Angeles Personnel Office Building. It is located at 212 North Vignes Street, south of Temple Street, and over a block south of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments. Because of the distance and because there would be no effects to character-defining features, the General Electric Building is outside of the APE.

□ **4th Street Viaduct**

The 4th Street Viaduct was built in 1931 with Gothic Revival details. It carries vehicular traffic over several city streets, BNSF tracks on the west side of the Los Angeles River, the river itself, and UPRR tracks on the east side of the river. The designer was Merrill Butler and the contractor was Fisher, Ross, MacDonald & Kahn. The bridge is 2730 feet long (832.1 meters) and includes a clear span of 254 feet (77.4 meters) to bridge the Los Angeles River—the longest reinforced concrete arch span in Southern California at the time. It was determined eligible for the National Register as a result of the 1986 Department Bridge Survey. More information about bridge engineer and designer Merrill Butler is presented later in this section under the discussion regarding the Macy Street Undercrossing. The proposed project would return to grade well to the north of the 4th Street Viaduct, where it would join the existing BNSF tracks that are located under the viaduct. Because there would be no demonstrable change to the railroad operations or tracks under the 4th Street Viaduct, it is outside the APE.

❑ **AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Watchman's Tower**

The AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Watchman's Tower (Redondo Junction Tower), was previously determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register in 1994 as a result of the Section 106 compliance process for the Alameda Corridor Improvement Project. Built in 1924, Redondo Junction Tower was found eligible as part of the AT&SF Redondo Junction/Butte Street Yard District under criteria A and C at the local level of significance. Redondo Junction Tower is located across existing BNSF tracks, approximately 200 feet (60.9 meters) to the east of the proposed site of the Amtrak mail transfer facility. Because there would be no demonstrable change to the historic property or its setting, it is outside the APE.

Archaeological Sites Near, but Outside the APE

The following archaeological sites are located in the vicinity of the proposed project, but would not be affected by it.

❑ **CA-LAN-7/H**

This archaeological site was originally recorded in 1951 as “apparently a dump area for Los Angeles Chinatown of 1850-70” and noted as located “across the street from Union Station.” The recorders in 1951 noted ongoing destruction by on-ramp construction. A 1980 site record update noted that there was disturbance from on-ramp construction and possibly from relic collectors but that intact deposits remained.

❑ **CA-LAN-887/H**

Recorded in 1978, this archaeological site is described as a “triangular area on east side of El Pueblo de Los Angeles State Historic Park” under the present *Placita de Dolores*, currently under a parking lot. The site, about a half a block from the APE, contained “distinct artifact components and structural remains from the Spanish occupation through the 1950s” and was, in 1978, in the process of being nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.

❑ **CA-LAN-1112H**

This archaeological site is within El Pueblo State Historic Park, in an area previously designated “Old Plaza Church.” The site, more than a block west of the Project APE, was recorded in 1981, and was described as “foundations for one or more buildings...contains early 19th-century padres house, cemetery and garden area” with structural remains from 1822.

❑ **19-002563**

This archaeological site, located on the east side of Santa Fe Avenue is a historical trash deposit dating from 1860 to 1892. The site, about 200 feet (60.9 meters) west of the APE, was previously the location of La Grande Railroad Station, which was built in 1893, and demolished in the 1930s.

❑ **19-002610**

This archaeological site, east of South Santa Fe Avenue, was recorded in 1997 when trenching activities exposed granite cobblestone pavement below the existing asphalt street.

❑ **19-002791**

This site was recorded in 1999 and was identified as the archaeological deposits within the Pico-Garnier Block. This area is located more than a block west of the APE within El Pueblo State Historic Park.

❑ **19-002929**

This site is the archaeological deposit associated with the Pelanconi House (La Golondrina Café), a brick building built in 1855. This site is located east of Main Street and west of Alameda Street and south of Macy Street, within El Pueblo State Historic Park.

❑ **19-120014**

This archaeological site is located under the basement of the Merced Theatre Building within El Pueblo State Historic Park.

❑ **CA-LAN-2858H**

CA-LAN-2858H was a large historical refuse deposit located in the vicinity of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility. This site was found during cultural resources monitoring for the Alameda Transportation Corridor Project in 2000.

❑ **CA-LAN-2862H**

CA-LAN-2862H was a buried, poured concrete slab foundation associated with a now-removed building, and was discovered during cultural resources monitoring for the Alameda Transportation Corridor Project in 2000. It is located in the vicinity of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility.

□ **CA-LAN-2865H**

CA-LAN-2865H was an abandoned, reinforced concrete pipe culvert situated under the historic AT&SF roadbed approximately 100 feet (30.5 meters) southeast of the junction of E. Washington Blvd. and Butte Street, about 110 feet (33.5 meters) south of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility. Discovered during cultural resources monitoring for the Alameda Transportation Corridor Project in 2000, this site was documented and photographed prior to removal during construction.

□ **CA-LAN-2878H**

CA-LAN-2878H was a surface deposit of historical refuse situated in a small ravine immediately adjacent to the south side of the Redondo Junction Switching Tower, about 440 feet (134 meters) southeast of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility. This site was discovered during cultural resources monitoring for the Alameda Transportation Corridor Project in 2000.

□ **CA-LAN-3072H**

CA-LAN-3072H consisted of a buried concrete structure exposed during construction activities within the Amtrak railroad yard, about 160 feet (48.7 meters) east of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility. Discovered during cultural resources monitoring for the Alameda Transportation Corridor Project in 2000, this site was monitored, documented, and photographed during construction. Portions of this feature were removed during Alameda Corridor construction.

b. Identify Consulting and Interested Parties

The Section 106 regulations require that a federal agency evaluate all properties within the APE and identify historic properties by gathering information from consulting parties, applying the National Register Criteria, and seeking concurrence from the SHPO or Indian tribe, as appropriate. During the preparation of this EIS, FRA and the Department have identified the following consulting parties for historic properties within the APE:

- California SHPO
- Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council – Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson
- Gabrielino/Tongva Council – Anthony Morales, Chairperson
- TI’At Society
- Samuel H. Dunlap, Gabrielino Tribe
- Craig Torres, Gabrielino Tongva Tribe
- Alfred L. Valenzuela, Gabrielino, Serrano, Vanyume, Chumash, Tataviam, and Kitanemuk Tribes
- Jim Valasques, Gabrielino Tribe

The Department, on behalf of FRA, held consultation meetings with the California SHPO on July 11, 2002; December 12, 2002; and June 13, 2003. Letters were sent to the listed Native American groups and individuals on November 4, 2002. Mr. Robert F. Dorame responded to this letter via telephone. He requested that a Native American monitor be present during the Project’s excavation phase.

In addition, scoping meetings were held in June 2002 for local government agencies and other interested parties, and an individual meeting was held with the Los Angeles Conservancy on July 1, 2002. Letters were sent to other potentially interested parties on January 21, 2002, including the following:

- AIA Los Angeles
- California Preservation Foundation
- California Historical Society
- Chinese Historical Society
- California State Railroad Museum
- El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument/Avilla Adobe
- Friends of the Los Angeles River
- Getty Conservation Institute
- Historical Society of Southern California
- Japanese American National Museum
- Lincoln Heights Historical Society
- Lomita Railroad Museum
- Los Angeles Conservancy
- Los Angeles City Historical Society
- Los Angeles County Historic Landmarks and Records Commission
- Los Angeles Police Historical Society
- Los Angeles Railroad Heritage Foundation
- Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
- City of Los Angeles Planning Department
- City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission
- City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
- Natural History Museum
- Pacific Railroad Historical Society
- San Bernardino Railroad Historical Society

- Society of Architectural Historians, Southern California Chapter
- Southern Pacific Historical & Technical Society
- Southwest Museum
- Train Riders Association of California
- Train Web, Inc.
- The Transit Coalition
- Travel Town Transportation Museum
- Wheel Clicks

On January 15, 2004, the California SHPO sent a letter concurring with FRA's findings of National Register eligibility and effects on historic and architectural resources but had comments on the information provided on two archaeological resources. The letter is attached in Appendix B. As of April 15, 2004, no other written responses were received from the parties listed above.

c. National Register Criteria for Evaluation

In order for a property to be considered for inclusion in the National Register it must meet the criteria for evaluation set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.4, as follows:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

(a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

(b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

(c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Among other criteria considerations, a property which has achieved significance within the last 50 years is not considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register unless certain exceptional conditions are met. The 50-year age criterion for the proposed project has been set at 1957, which includes properties only 46 years old or older, but is in accordance with the "Caltrans Interim Policy for the Treatment of Buildings Constructed in 1957 or Later."

d. California Register Criteria for Evaluation

All properties listed in or determined eligible for the National Register are automatically listed in the California Register, and are therefore historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. In addition, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the term “historical resources” shall include the following:

(1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

(2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

(3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

As with the National Register, a property that has achieved significance within the last 50 years is not considered eligible for the California Register unless it is of exceptional importance.

e. Identifying Historic Properties

For the proposed project, surveys have been undertaken and documentation prepared in accordance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Identification of Historic Properties (48 FR 44716), using personnel who meet the Secretary of Interior’s Professional Standards (48 FR 22716) in the fields of ethnography, pre-historic archaeology, historic archaeology, architectural history, and history. For the purposes of this document, the broad pool of cultural resources within the APE that require evaluation for National Register eligibility may be categorized into two major types, as follows:

- 1) Archaeological Resources, which include resources that represent important evidence of past human behavior, including portable artifacts such as arrowheads or tin cans; non-portable “features” such as cooking hearths, foundations, and privies; or residues such as food remains and charcoal. Archaeological remains can be virtually any age, from yesterday’s trash to prehistoric deposits thousands of years old.
- 2) Historic and Architectural Resources, which include human-made features that make up the recognizable built environment. This category typically includes extant, above-ground buildings and structures that date from the earliest territorial settlements until the present day.

3-5.1.3 Archaeological Resources

a. Identification Methodology

Archival Research

A records and literature search was undertaken on July 24, 2002, to determine the proximity of previously documented prehistoric and historical archaeological resources to the APE and to help establish a context for resource significance. The records of the South Central Coastal Information Center, California Historical Resources Inventory System, was consulted and appropriate site records obtained. Numerous previous studies of archaeological resources in and adjacent to the APE were also reviewed. These resources were examined in order to identify previously recorded prehistoric or historical archaeological sites, and to assess the general potential of the area to contain archaeological deposits. The following inventories and sources were consulted:

- The National Register of Historic Places, National Register Information System, updated through February 2002
- California Register of Historical Resources
- California Office of Historic Preservation Historical Resources Inventory System
- California Historical Landmarks
- California Points of Historical Interest

Research was also conducted using topographic maps, geologic information, and Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps of Los Angeles. In addition, available local, regional, and railroad histories were consulted.

Field Reconnaissance

An archaeological field reconnaissance of the APE was undertaken on April 3, 2003. During these field investigations, the APE was examined on foot and via automobile. This assessment confirmed that the primary Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project APE is covered with pavement, buildings, or railroad ballast, thereby preventing any inspection of the natural ground surface within the APE for prehistoric cultural resources or for buried historic-era sites. Observable within the APE were foundations of removed buildings, and railroad tracks in the streets. The Amtrak mail transfer facility APE was not field inspected during the survey described above. Qualified archaeologists had previously surveyed the Amtrak mail transfer facility APE during work associated with the Alameda Transportation Corridor Project. This survey had indicated that this portion of the APE was also entirely covered with pavement, buildings, or railroad ballast, thereby preventing any inspection of the natural ground surface within the APE for prehistoric cultural resources or for buried historic-era sites.

b. Prehistoric and Historical Archaeological Resources Identified

The results of the records search, background research and field reconnaissance by qualified archaeologists is presented as a technical document to this EIS entitled: *Positive Archaeological Survey Report*, which is an appendix to the *Historic Properties Survey Report*. The records search, field reconnaissance, and subsequent research identified two sites within the APE, including:

- one property previously recommended as eligible for the National Register
- one property identified and recommended as potentially eligible for the National Register as a result of the current Section 106 identification effort, but which requires further study.

Properties listed in the National Register or determined eligible for listing in the National Register are automatically listed in the California Register. The final determination of historic properties listed below is subject to change as a result of Section 106 consultation with the SHPO regarding National Register eligibility.

Two historical archaeological sites are known to exist within the Project APE. The first is CA-LAN1575/H, the historic Euro-American and Chinatown neighborhood, and prehistoric cemetery found surrounding Union Station. The second is a single track Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (AT&SF) railroad siding found in Commercial Street and in Block 17 on the southwest corner of the intersection of Commercial and Garey. The AT&SF system has been recorded as an archaeological site in parts of southern California (i.e. as CA-SBR-6693H in San Bernardino County and as 33-9776 in Riverside County), and numerous small features associated with the AT&SF have been recorded as sites in Los Angeles County. The railroad siding found within the Project APE has been recorded as a historical archaeological site, which is potentially eligible for listing in the National Register, but for which further study is needed because evaluation was not possible. No site number has yet been issued.

c. Properties previously recommended for listing in the National Register

CA-LAN-1575/H

Multi-component archaeological site CA-LAN-1575/H encompasses the area surrounding Union Station south of Macy Street, west of Vignes Street, east of U.S. 101 and east of Alameda Street. This site was first recorded in 1989 in association with discoveries of historic-era cultural remains made during monitoring and excavation for the Metro Rail Project. Materials recovered were associated with a ca.1860-1930s Chinatown.

In 1996, excavations at CA-LAN-1575/H for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's Headquarters building exposed numerous historic-era features.

Beneath this old Los Angeles neighborhood, a prehistoric cemetery was also found.

In a letter dated January 15, 2004, SHPO made the following statement:

I have not found evidence that SHPO concurred with any previous determination of NRHP eligibility for this property. If you have documentation attesting to SHPO concurrence, please provide it as soon as possible. I agree that there is a high potential that portions of this site extend into the current project's APE.

No evidence has been found that SHPO has been directly and clearly asked to concur with an eligibility determination for CA-LAN-1575/H. Excavations in historical deposits and the Native American cemetery for the MWD Headquarters Building in 1996 were performed to Section 106 standards. However, the subject property was conducted under CEQA, and SHPO was not involved. Reports for earlier project, e.g., the Metro Red Line Segment One, discuss a memorandum of Agreement that included the SHPO (Greenwood 1993:1). This report further states that:

Union Station itself is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for its architectural and historical values. The entire block is now recognized as significant under NRHP Criterion A (association with a pattern of events significant to the cultural traditions of a community); and Criterion D, as an historic archaeological property that has been partially excavated, has yielded important data, and still retains substantial and intact deposits.

It appears that SHPO was never asked to concur with this eligibility determination for CA-LAN-1575/H, rather it was assumed that the site was already eligible as part of the Union Station complex.

d. Properties identified as potentially eligible for listing in the National Register as part of this Project but for which further study is needed because evaluation was not possible

Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Siding (19-003169)

Site 19-003169, a set of railroad tracks within the Project APE, was recorded as a historical archaeological site in 2003. These tracks occur in two parts. First is a railroad siding exposed in the pavement of Commercial Street in the block between Garey and N. Hewitt Streets, depicted on the 1906 Sanborn fire insurance map. Second, another segment of this railroad siding extends across a now-vacant parcel, a block bounded by Commercial, N. Garey, Ducommun and N. Hewitt streets. This portion of the railroad spur is not depicted on the 1906 Sanborn, but does appear on the 1937-50 Sanborn. At that time, this railroad spur led to the L.A. Bureau of Water Works and Supply Yard, outside of the Project APE on Alameda Street. It should be noted that this more modern, 1937-1950 rail spur follows, very approximately, an angled property line through this block; this angled property line was originally part of the zanja ditch system, the earliest water supply for the City of Los Angeles.

This siding is part of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway (AT&SF), which played a prominent role in the development and economic growth of Los Angeles, southern California, and in a larger context, of the United States as a whole. Originally built into Los Angeles in 1888 as the Southern California Railway Company, these routes were acquired by the AT&SF in 1905. The AT&SF was the one of the first continental railroad routes into California, and the first to break the monopoly of the Southern Pacific Railroad. This rail system was instrumental in the development of Los Angeles as a major commercial center, and enabled the immigration of large numbers of people. The AT&SF system facilitated transportation of goods to the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach; site 19-003169 is a small part of this larger historical pattern.

Site 19-003169 is an industrial lead constructed between 1894 and 1906, approximately 10 years after the AT&SF main line was constructed along the west side of the Los Angeles River. 19-003169 appears to have been initially built to serve the no longer extant Maier & Zobelein Brewery, which was located at the northwest corner of Commercial and Vignes Streets. 19-003169 does not appear individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for two reasons: (1) it was not built at the same time as the main line and therefore lacks sufficient direct association with the history of the AT&SF, and (2) it lacks integrity of setting, feeling and association because the original industrial building it served no longer exists. However, historical archaeological site 19-003169 is recommended as potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion D, as an archaeological site that may be likely to yield information important in history, specifically about the materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. Similarly, this property is potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources, for the same reasons. Further study is necessary because a complete evaluation of the resource's integrity and significance cannot be performed prior to construction.

In a letter dated January 15, 2004, SHPO made the following statement:

The documentation states the property appears eligible to the National Register under Criterion D because it may yield information about the materials and

location of typical industrial leads tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. The report does not include a research design that explains the information this property may contain, nor does it contain an explanation of why understanding more about materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks is considered important in any specific historic context. Absent this information, I, at this time, am unable to concur in this eligibility determination.

Previous excavations around railroad lines in Los Angeles, for example, the Alameda Corridor Project, have recovered several previously unknown subsurface features associated with railroad construction and use. The SHPO is correct in stating that a research design regarding historic railroads and railroad features has not been prepared, and lacking this context, it is difficult to evaluate railroad resources. The proposed eligibility evaluation for 19-003169 presented here is cautious, in case sites do provide information as part of a larger universe of historic-era railroad-related research issues.

e. Potential for Undiscovered Prehistoric Archaeological Resources

Previous studies in and around the Project APE indicate that there is a potential to find previously undiscovered prehistoric archaeological resources during project construction. The ground-disturbing activities associated with historic-era development within the Project APE makes quantifying this potential difficult. No prehistoric resources have been found in the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility portion of the APE. However, two or possibly three prehistoric artifacts have been reported in the general vicinity. Several previous projects within the Union Station Run-Through Tracks project portion of the APE have recovered prehistoric materials. Most notable was the MWD Headquarters construction in 1996.

Across Alameda Street from Union Station, various prehistoric finds have been reported in the vicinity of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles State Historic Park, under the present *Placita de Dolores*. These finds have been rare, but include prehistoric materials recovered at CA-LAN-7/H. Other Native American materials are reported from El Pueblo.

In terms of setting, the Project APE lies near the western bank of the Los Angeles River, a location favorable to human habitation. Ethnohistoric records suggest that a Native American village was located on the first river terrace above this channel. A summation of the best evidence suggests that this village, *Yaan'ga*, was, in 1769 at least, located near the intersection of modern day Main and Aliso Streets, about a quarter-mile southwest of Union Station, outside of the Project APE. A map depicting Los Angeles as it appeared in 1871 indicates that *Yaan'ga* may have been located near the intersection of Alameda and Commercial Streets. The burials at CA-LAN-1575/H may be associated with this village location.

Despite Native American occupation of the elevated terraces above the river, the broad, braided streambed of the Los Angeles River prior to channelization, was most likely not a good location for prehistoric occupation. This river channel was located generally east of Alameda Street in the 19th century; accordingly, the Project APE is completely within this old river channel. However, since the channel may have been used as a water source or for food processing, scouring may have carried away traces of such activities during flooding. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the soil layers containing burials within the prehistoric cemetery at CA-LAN-1575/H are located within the river flood plain just at the western edge before the first

terrace. These soils were sealed by a younger graded deposit of pebbly silty sand deposited during a river flood episode subsequent to the burials; this flood did not disturb this prehistoric cultural deposit.

Prehistoric cultural materials could be found anywhere within the Project APE. Present evidence suggests that they are most likely to be encountered within the vicinity of the known prehistoric cemetery at CA-LAN-1575/H; but artifacts and human remains could be found in other areas of the Project APE.

The portions of the proposed Project that require the installation of pile deep underground have the potential to cut through intact older sediments that could yield prehistoric archaeological materials. In addition, because pile excavation will involve auguring and spoils would be removed at the ground surface, any cultural resource present would be damaged or destroyed and may not be identifiable. Although these intact older sediments have a high potential for prehistoric cultural resources, due to the buried nature of these deposits, it is unknown whether such resources are actually present in the exact location where piles will be constructed. Consequently, there is a potential for significant impacts to cultural resources, if present.

f. Potential for Undiscovered Historic Archaeological Resources

South of U.S. 101 in vacant lots along Commercial Street, cement floors of structures were observed in vacant lots in the Project APE, and these structural remains may well conceal earlier subsurface historical features. One of these blocks, at the northwest corner of the intersection of Commercial Street and Vignes street, is believed to have been the location of the Vignes Adobe. An early map of the area shows lands between today's Aliso Street and a field of willows, bordering the Rio Porciuncula, as the vineyard of Jean Louis Vignes, who arrived in Los Angeles in 1829. Remains of this important early winery may yet be present subsurface in these now-vacant city blocks. In addition, construction under railroad tracks, streets, or the U.S. 101 freeway may encounter historic-era deposits preserved beneath the present artificial surface. The potential for undiscovered significant historical archaeological sites within the Project APE is very high.

The portions of the proposed Project that require the installation of pile deep underground have the potential to cut through intact sediments that could yield historical archaeological materials. In addition, because pile excavation will involve auguring and spoils would be removed at the ground surface, any cultural resource present would be damaged or destroyed and may not be identifiable. In most cases, unless deep fill has been emplaced, these historical deposits are likely to be within six to 10 feet of the present ground surface. Although these intact older sediments have a high potential for historical cultural resources, due to the buried nature of these deposits, it is unknown whether such resources are actually present in the exact location where piles will be constructed. Consequently, there is a potential for significant impacts to cultural resources, if present.

3-5.1.4 Historic and Architectural Resources

a. Identification Methodology

Records Search

A background research survey was undertaken to identify previously documented historic and architectural resources within and near the APE and to help establish a context for resource significance. National, state and local inventories of architectural/historic resources were examined in order to identify significant local historical events and personages, development patterns, and unique interpretations of architectural styles. The following inventories and sources were consulted:

- The National Register of Historic Places, National Register Information System, updated through February 2000
- California Register of Historical Resources
- California Office of Historic Preservation Historical Resources Inventory System
- California Historical Landmarks
- California Points of Historical Interest
- City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments

Field Survey

A field survey of all properties within the APE was undertaken according to standard Section 106 regulations and related procedures. Field investigations were conducted by qualified architectural historians on several occasions in 2002. Boundaries of the APE were confirmed, and an assessment was made of all extant buildings and structures within the APE to determine if their age and integrity warranted application of National Register criteria. The field survey of historic and architectural resources included the following steps:

- A field survey consisting of a visual onsite examination of every parcel within the APE, including an assessment of integrity.
- Identification of the age of all major buildings, structures, objects, and potentially coherent districts located within the APE.
- Photography of each potential district feature, major structure, building, or object within the APE.
- Review in the field of previous survey data, comments from interested parties, and lists of significant historic properties.

Following the field survey, site-specific research was conducted from the following sources:

- Building Permits, City of Los Angeles
- City Directories of Los Angeles, California.

In addition, information was requested from the following organizations and individuals:

- John Signor, Railroad Historian
- Mike McGinley, SCRRA Engineering Manager
- Johnny Johnson, Railroad Historian.

b. Significant Historic and Architectural Resources Identified

The results of the records search, background research, and field survey by qualified architectural historians was recorded on California Historic Resource Inventory forms (Series DPR 523), and submitted to the California SHPO on November 3, 2003, and is reproduced as a technical document to this EIS entitled: *Historical Resources Evaluation Report*, which is an appendix to the *Historic Properties Survey Report*. The records search, field surveys, and subsequent research identified the following, which are described in further detail in subsequent subsections:

- Five individual properties within the boundary of a property previously listed in the National Register (the Union Station complex)
- Two properties previously determined eligible for the National Register
- One property determined eligible for the National Register as a result of the Los Angeles Union Station Section 106 identification effort

- One property that was previously determined ineligible for the National Register and does not meet California Register criteria
- Seven properties with buildings or structures constructed in or before 1956 that do not meet National Register criteria because either they do not retain integrity from their period of significance, or are not associated with an important historic context
- Six properties with buildings constructed in or after 1957 that are not eligible for the National Register because they possess no known association with an important historic context that would override the National Register's 50-year age criterion consideration.

Properties listed in the National Register or determined eligible for listing in the National Register are automatically listed in the California Register. The properties found not to be eligible for the National Register were also found not to meet the California Register criteria. In a letter dated January 15, 2004, the SHPO concurred with the final determination of historic properties listed below.

Properties Listed in the National Register

The Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal (LAUPT or Union Station) complex, 800 North Alameda Street, was listed in the National Register under Criterion C on November 13, 1980, at the national level of significance, and it was also designated as City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument 101 on August 2, 1972. The City's monument boundary includes the passenger terminal building, attached service buildings, and the parking lots along Alameda Street, but excludes the appurtenant railroad tracks along the east side that contributed to the National Register listing at the national level of significance. Union Station was documented in the Historic American Buildings Survey, Survey Number HABS CA 2-258-A. Five major buildings and structures are located within the property boundary of Union Station indicated on the National Register nomination:

□ Union Station Buildings, Passenger Platforms, Canopies and Tracks

The National Register nomination form of the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal (Union Station), specifically identifies the main buildings that make up the station terminal along with its associated services areas and passenger platforms, canopies and tracks. Union Station is considered significant both for its historical association with the development of railroad transportation in the United States and for the quality of its architectural design (see Figure 3-5.3). Built from 1934 through 1939, Union Station is considered the last grand railroad station constructed in the United States. Its construction resulted in the consolidation of local passenger operations among the Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, and Santa Fe Railroads.



Figure 3-5.3: Union Station

Union Station was the point of origin and destination for several famous transcontinental “streamliners” such as Southern Pacific’s *Daylight* and *Golden State*; Union Pacific’s *City of Los Angeles*; and Santa Fe’s *Super Chief*, *California Limited*, and *El Capitan*.

The image of Union Station and its associated streamliners became synonymous with the concept of long-distance passenger travel in Los Angeles until it was effectively displaced with the introduction of reliable jet service to Los Angeles International Airport in the late 1950s. Union Station’s architectural design by consulting architects John and Donald Parkinson, Union Pacific’s R. J. Wirth, Southern Pacific’s J. H. Christie, and Santa Fe’s H. L. Gilman blended the Spanish Colonial Revival style with the Streamline Moderne style. This unique blend of historic and modern styles at once reflected both the historic character of Los Angeles and the evolution of railroad technology from steam to diesel power. John Parkinson was one of Los Angeles’ most prominent architects in the early 20th century.

❑ Terminal Tower

Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal Tower (LAUPT Tower or Terminal Tower) served the Union Pacific Railroad, AT&SF Railway, and Southern Pacific Railroad as a consolidated interlocking tower. It is located on a raised parcel at 413 Bauchet Street, east of the Throat of the Union Station railroad lead tracks (see Figure 3-5.4). Constructed in 1938 in concert with Union Station, the three-story building with its clay tile roof reflects the Spanish Colonial Revival influences of the main depot, despite being an essentially industrial building. The roof has a wide overhang with closed eaves, characteristically extended for improved tower visibility.

In 1997, SCRRA closed the tower and now controls railroad traffic from a centralized site in Pomona, approximately 60 miles to the east. Terminal Tower is now used for maintenance and storage. While Terminal Tower was included within the National Register boundary, it was not specifically identified as a contributing feature. The National Register nomination stated: “The Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal complex is significant in the history of transportation in Los Angeles, the state, and the nation. Its integrated design reflects the historical evolution through years of litigation to consolidate three major railroads into a single terminal complex. In addition, the main passenger terminal building remains one of the great architectural statements of its time.” As an integral part of the Union Station complex, Terminal Tower is a contributing feature and within the boundary of the National Register-listed property.

❑ Macy Street Undercrossing

The Macy Street Undercrossing, now Cesar Chavez Avenue Undercrossing, (Department Bridge No. 53C-131) carries vehicular traffic under the Union Station tracks. Its main span is a reinforced concrete, earth filled, elliptical, 68-foot (20.7 meters) long arch (see Figure 3-5.5). The bridge is 56 feet (17 meters) wide, with one span 30 feet (9.1 meters) long. It allows for four lanes of traffic to pass underneath the arch span. It features an arched window rail, with rough concrete texture. Its design is very similar to the Vignes Street Bridge and retaining walls at Union Station. The Macy Street Undercrossing was constructed in 1931. It was designed by Merrill Butler of the City of Los Angeles.



Figure 3-5.4: Terminal Tower



Figure 3-5.5: Macy Street Undercrossing

During a career at the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering that spanned four decades, Merrill Butler supervised the construction of over 200 bridges. Merrill Butler came to the Bureau of Engineering in 1923 at the height of the City Beautiful movement and during a time when the City of Los Angeles was busily constructing bridges and viaducts to move people, goods and utilities more efficiently through the city. The bridges he designed reflect the building styles that were popular at the time, using architectural elements to distinguish these bridges from one another and create gateways for new and existing communities throughout the growing city.

Fifteen bridges designed during his tenure at the Bureau of Engineering have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, of which twelve are river crossings. Six of these bridges are listed locally as Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments. These bridges are among a large group that is considered the best examples of river crossings from the period 1923-1961 in California, as well as the United States. Within the project APE, Merrill Butler also designed the Vignes Street Bridge under the LAUPT tracks as well as the 1st Street Viaduct over the Los Angeles River.

As an integral part of the Union Station complex, the Macy Street Undercrossing is a contributing feature of and is within the boundary of the National Register-listed property.

□ **Vignes Street Undercrossing**

The Vignes Street Undercrossing, (Department Bridge No. 53C-1764), carries vehicular traffic under the Union Station tracks. Its main span is reinforced concrete, earth filled, elliptical, 68-foot (20.7 meters) long arch (see Figure 3-5.6). The bridge is 30 feet (9.1 meters) wide, with one span 80 feet (24.3 meters) long. It allows for four lanes (originally two lanes) of traffic to pass underneath the arch span. It features an arched window rail, with smooth concrete texture. Its design is very similar to the Macy Street Undercrossing and retaining walls at Union Station. The Vignes Street Undercrossing was designed by Merrill Butler and constructed in 1937, concurrently with Union Station.

As an integral part of the Union Station complex, the Vignes Street Undercrossing is a contributing feature of and is within the boundary of the National Register-listed property.

□ **Car Supply/Repair Shop**

The Car Supply/Repair Shop building was built in 1937 and is sited on a raised parcel at the northwest corner of Avila Street and Cesar E. Chavez Avenue (formerly Macy Street) (see Figure 3-5.7). The building served a utilitarian function as part of the overall Union Station complex and continues to function as a support building for railroad operations. As an integral part of the Union Station complex, the Car Supply/Repair Shop building is a contributing feature of and is within the boundary of the National Register-listed property.



Figure 3-5.6: Vignes Street Undercrossing




Figure 3-5.7: Car Supply/Repair Shop

Properties previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register

This category includes two properties.

□ **1st Street Viaduct**

The 1st Street Viaduct, (Department Bridge No. 53C-1166), was built in 1929 with Neoclassical details (see Figure 3-5.8). It carries vehicular traffic over the BNSF tracks on the west side of the river, Los Angeles River, and UPRR tracks on the east side of the river. The designer was Merrill Butler. The bridge is 71 feet (21.6 meters) wide, with 28 spans and reaches a length of 1300 feet (396.2 meters). The reinforced concrete bridge features an open spandrel elliptical 125-foot (38.1 meters) arch. It was determined eligible for the National Register as a result of the 1986 Department Bridge Survey.

□ **AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices**

The AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices (AT&SF Offices) was previously determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places in 1994 as a result of the Section 106 compliance process for the Alameda Corridor Improvement Project (see Figure 3-5.9). The AT&SF Offices were found eligible as part of the AT&SF Redondo Junction/Butte Street Yard District under criteria A and C at the local level of significance, but also appear eligible for the National Register on an individual basis, with a period of significance of 1920.

Properties Determined Eligible for Listing in the National Register as a Result of the Section 106 Identification Process for this Project

One property has been determined eligible for the National Register.

□ **Mission Tower**

Mission Tower historically served the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway as an interlocking tower (see Figure 3-5.10). The tower occupies a spot a quarter-mile from the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal (Union Station), near the intersection of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Union Pacific Railroad, and Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. Historically, Mission Tower operated in conjunction with another signal tower, Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal Tower, located at the throat of the station's tracks, to control railroad traffic in and out of Union Station. The architectural style of Mission Tower suggests Spanish Colonial Revival influences, with its tile roof and closed eaves, which are characteristically extended for railroad tower visibility. Incised lettering spells "Mission Tower" on the northern and southern façades.



Figure 3-5.8: 1st Street Viaduct



Figure 3-5.9: AT&SF Offices



Figure 3-5.10: Mission Tower

Mission Tower was constructed by the Santa Fe Railway in 1916 and later enlarged in 1938 to monitor railroad traffic coming to and from Union Station. Mission Tower is located outside the National Register boundary of Union Station, but was closely associated with the construction and operation of Union Station after it was enlarged in 1938. Mission Tower appears eligible for the National Register under Criterion A, for its association with the development and operations of the Santa Fe Railway in Los Angeles and its association with Union Station. Mission Tower also appears eligible under Criterion C, as an example of a Spanish Colonial Revival railroad switching tower, which exhibits a high degree of architectural quality for this type of property, and has retained a high degree of all aspects of integrity from its period of significance, 1938. (In a letter dated January 15, 2004, SHPO concurred with FRA's finding that Mission Tower is eligible for the National Register under criteria A and C.)

Properties Previously Determined Ineligible for the National Register

There is one property within the APE in this category.

- U.S. 101 Bridge over the Los Angeles River (Department Bridge No. 53-0405), built 1944, altered in 1955 (see Figure 3-5.11)

Properties constructed before 1957 found to be ineligible for the National Register as a result of the Section 106 Identification Process for this project

Seven properties are in this category. They are:

- Amay's Bakery & Noodle Co., 837 Commercial Street, built 1939-1944
- New York Junk Co., 622 Frontage Road and 825 Commercial Street, built 1946
- Kahn-Beck Co.; Friedman Bag Co.-Textile Division, 600-620 Center Street/801-817 Commercial Street, built 1902; altered in 1906, 1941, 1958, and 1966
- Thomas R. Barrabee Store and Warehouse, 611-615 Ducommun Street, built 1926
- Friedman Bag Co. Storage Building, 500 Garey Street, built 1955
- Los Angeles Casing Co., 710-714 Ducommun Street, built 1920
- Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) District H Facilities Services and Maintenance Operations, 611 Jackson Street, built 1937.



Figure 3-5.11: U.S. 101 Bridge

Properties constructed after 1957 which do not meet the National Register or California Register age criterion, and which have no overriding significance

This category includes six properties.

- Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power Parking Structure, 301 N. Garey Street, built post-1973
- Warehouse, 620 Commercial Street, built 1963
- Friedman Bag Co., 706 Ducommun Street, built 1959
- Friedman Bag Co., 711 Ducommun Street, built 1966
- Food Processing Plant, 411 Center Street, built 1980; 1985
- Manley Oil/Former So. California Gas Co., 410 Center Street, built 1957.

3-5.1.5 Paleontologic Resources

To identify the potential for encountering paleontological resources for CEQA compliance, the Division of Geological Sciences of the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM) completed a literature review and records search for the LAUS Run-Through Tracks project.

Previous geologic mapping of this portion of Los Angeles indicates that the Union Station property is located entirely upon Recent alluvium. This sedimentary unit has low potential to contain fossil resources, and therefore has low paleontologic sensitivity. However, it is likely that older Pleistocene sediments are present in this area. Should such sediments be exposed during excavation, they would have high paleontologic sensitivity. The marine Fernando Formation, a fossiliferous rock unit dating to the Pliocene Epoch (more than 2 million years in age), may also be present. This rock unit also has high paleontologic sensitivity. It is not known for certain how deep below the existing ground surface either of these fossil-bearing rock units might be located.

The literature search of the Regional Paleontologic Locality Inventory at the SBCM indicates that no paleontologic resource localities are mapped within the APE. However, five locations have shown fossiliferous sediments in the area. Locality LACM 4726 is situated approximately 1.5 miles (2.4 kilometers) west of the Union Station site and yielded fish fossils from the marine Fernando Formation. This site is significant in that the fossil-bearing rock unit was located in the subsurface; surface sediments are mapped as Recent alluvium similar to what is present along the proposed alignments. Locality LACM 3868, located roughly 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) west-northwest of the APE also yielded fish fossils from the Fernando Formation. Locality LACM 3250 yielded fossil remains of extinct mammoth (*Mammuthus*) from subsurface Pleistocene older alluvium overlain by Recent alluvium approximately 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) northwest of Union Station. Finally, localities LACM 1198 and LACM 7137, located roughly 5 miles (8 kilometers) west-northwest from Union Station, yielded fossil remains of mastodon, camel and bison from Pleistocene older alluvium. All of these Pleistocene localities demonstrate that

Pleistocene sediments are present in the subsurface in and around the study area. However, it is not recorded in the Regional Paleontologic Locality Inventory the depth below surface at which the fossils from these localities were recovered.

A paleontological impacts assessment was conducted for the EIR for the Northeast Interceptor Sewer project in 2000. The sewer project alignments traveled in the near vicinity (east) of the Run-Through Tracks project. According to that EIR, the Recent alluvium in the project area (vicinity of U.S. 101) is considered to have low paleontologic sensitivity. However, the recent sediments may overlie older Pleistocene or Miocene sediments in the subsurface, which are highly sensitive.

3-5.2 Environmental Impacts

3-5.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Potential impacts were determined by comparing the effects of the Run-Through Tracks Project to eligible historic resources against NEPA/Section 106 and CEQA criteria. These criteria are defined in the following subsections.

3-5.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

To comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, any effects of the proposed undertaking on properties listed in or determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register must be analyzed by applying the *Criteria of Adverse Effect* [36 CFR Part 800.5(a)], as follows:

(1) Criteria of adverse effect. An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

(2) Examples of adverse effects. Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:

- (i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
- (ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not

consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines;

(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;

(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;

(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;

(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and

(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.

The above criteria apply to archaeological, historic and architectural resources.

b. CEQA

According to relevant part of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Part 15064.5:

(b) a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired. [§15064.5 (b)(1)]

The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources; or

[Not applicable]

Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

c. Paleontological Resource Impacts

Impacts to paleontological resources are not considered impacts under NEPA. Under CEQA, impacts to paleontological resources would be considered significant if there is a high likelihood of encountering unique paleontological resources that could damage or destroy the resources as a result of excavation.

3-5.2.3 Historic Properties for Which There Is No Effect

Application of the Section 106 and CEQA impact criteria indicates that the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would have No Adverse Effect or No Effect on the following six properties:

a. LAUPT Tower (Terminal Tower)

Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal Tower (LAUPT Tower, or Terminal Tower, APE Map ID #2) is located within the National Register boundary of Union Station and was constructed in 1938 as an integral part of Union Station. Therefore, it is a contributing feature of a property listed in the National and California Registers. Terminal Tower is located just east of the “throat area” of the Union Station railroad tracks (see plan sheet 6 for Alignment A and A-1). The reconstruction of the throat area involves removing the existing track and constructing new prefabricated track, installing double slip switches, rail ties and crushed rock. Railroad tracks, switches, ties and ballast are typically replaced as part of routine maintenance. These elements in the Throat area of Union Station are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the early 1990s following construction of the MTA Red Line subway and station. No grade changes are proposed in the track area near Terminal Tower.

In 1997, SCRRRA closed the tower and now controls railroad traffic from a centralized facility in Pomona. At present, Terminal Tower is used for maintenance and storage. The proposed project would not change the present use or otherwise alter Terminal Tower in any way. The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would result in some changes to its setting, but this would be limited to the replacement of non-historic railroad tracks, switches, ties and ballast.

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

Under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project’s effects on Terminal Tower would result in a finding of “no effect” on this historic property. Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a “substantial adverse change in the significance of” Terminal Tower, and would not be a significant effect.

b. Macy Street (Cesar Chavez Avenue) Bridge under LAUPT Tracks

The Macy Street (now Cesar Chavez Avenue) Bridge under LAUS tracks (Macy Street Undercrossing, APE Map #4) is located within the National Register boundary of Union Station and was constructed in 1931 as the earliest part of the Union Station complex. Therefore, it is a contributing feature of a property listed in the National and California Registers. The Macy Street Undercrossing is located to the northeast of the Union Station Building Terminal and

carries the multiple tracks and platforms of Union Station over Cesar Chavez Avenue before they become joined in the Throat area.

As a result of this project, Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 (see Figure 2-14) would be raised approximately five feet (1.5 meters) above the existing grade level of the deck of the Macy Street Undercrossing. This would accommodate the clearance of the proposed Run-Through tracks over the El Monte Busway and the U.S. 101. To raise the platforms and tracks up to this height, a lightweight engineered fill would be placed on top of the Macy Street Bridge Undercrossing along with associated retaining walls (see Figure 2-11). There would be no structural changes to the Macy Street Bridge Undercrossing and no physical alteration to the structure below the surface of the deck.

Section 106 Analysis

Under Section 106, only Criteria of Adverse Effect examples *ii*, *iv*, and *v* warrant discussion with regard to the Macy Street Undercrossing.

Criteria example *ii*-Alteration: Under criteria example *ii*, there would be no alteration to the actual bridge structure, but Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 would be altered by being raised approximately four feet (1.2 meters) above the bridge deck atop fill and associated retaining walls. The railroad tracks, switches, ties and ballast above the Macy Street Undercrossing are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the early 1990s following construction of the MTA Red Line subway and station. Because the bridge structure itself would not be altered, and because the railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast are not historical material, there would be no adverse effect under criteria example *ii*.

Criteria example *iv*-Change of use or setting: The Macy Street Undercrossing would still be used to carry Union Station train traffic over Cesar Chavez Avenue. Therefore there would be no change in use of the property. Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 may be considered “physical features within the setting” of the Macy Street Undercrossing, but the changes to them would not be adverse following the same reasoning provided under criteria example *ii*.

Criteria example *v*-Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements: Atmospheric and audible elements would continue to be generated by train traffic over, and vehicular traffic under, the Macy Street Undercrossing, with no demonstrable change from current conditions. The elevation of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 by approximately four feet (1.2 meters) would result in the introduction of new visual elements above the deck of the Macy Street Undercrossing (the retaining walls). However, the retaining walls would not be noticeable from most public vantage points, and their introduction would not diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features, which are the materials and design of the reinforced concrete bridge structure (see Figure 3-17.23 in the Visual Impacts section).

Under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project’s effects on the Macy Street Undercrossing would result in a finding of “no effect” on this historic property.

CEQA Analysis

Under CEQA, the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would result in an alteration of some of the tracks and platforms above the deck of the Macy Street Undercrossing. The alterations would not change the characteristics that convey its historical significance. The design and materials of the reinforced concrete bridge would remain unchanged. The railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast above the Macy Street Undercrossing are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the mid-1990s following construction of the MTA Red Line subway and station. Since the bridge would continue to carry train traffic over vehicular traffic, its historic use would remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed elevation of the tracks would not adversely alter those characteristics that convey the historical significance of the resource. Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a “substantial adverse change in the significance of” the Macy Street Undercrossing, and would not be a significant effect.

c. Vignes Street Bridge under LAUPT Tracks

The Vignes Street Bridge under LAUPT Tracks (Vignes Street Undercrossing, APE Map ID #3) is located within the National Register boundary of Union Station and was constructed in 1938 as an integral part of Union Station. It is a contributing feature of a property listed in the National and California Registers. The Vignes Street Undercrossing is located just north of Union Station Terminal’s throat area, where re-construction of the rail connecting tracks would be done in Stage 1 of construction. No grade changes are proposed in this area. The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would require tracks and switches in the Throat area to be altered for construction of Tracks 13 through 16 and later, for more efficient operations of all tracks. The re-construction of the Throat area involves removing some existing tracks and installing new tracks, installing double slip switches, rail ties and crushed rock. Railroad tracks, switches, ties and ballast are typically replaced as part of routine maintenance. Those in the Throat area of Union Station are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the mid-1980s following construction of the MTA Red Line subway and station. No grade changes are proposed in the track area near the Vignes Street Undercrossing.

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

The proposed project would not change the present use or otherwise alter the Vignes Street Undercrossing. The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would result in some changes to its setting, but this would be limited to the replacement of non-historic railroad tracks, switches, ties and ballast carried above the bridge deck. Under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project's effects on the Vignes Street Undercrossing would result in a finding of "no effect" on this historic property. Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a "substantial adverse change in the significance of" the Vignes Street Undercrossing, and would not be a significant effect.

d. 1st Street Viaduct

Constructed in 1929, the 1st Street Viaduct (1st Street Bridge) carries 1st Street vehicular traffic over the BNSF tracks and railway yard, Amtrak and SCRRA tracks, the Los Angeles River, and the UPRR tracks (APE Map ID #14). In 1986, the 1st Street Viaduct (the bridge's formal name) was determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places; therefore, it is automatically listed in the California Register. The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would involve track realignments, grade changes, and the construction of a MSE (Mechanically Stabilized Earth) wall near the viaduct. Proposed construction will take place to the north of, and would include trackwork partly under, the 1st Street Bridge. The MSE wall, which is part of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project's trestle segment, would start about 75 feet (22.8 meters) north (for Alignment A) or 150 feet (45.7 meters) north (for Alignment A-1) from the 1st Street Bridge (see Figure 2-21 and Figure 2-25 in Chapter 2). The MSE wall will begin at a height of approximately 4 feet (1.2 meters) and rise to a maximum of 25 feet (7.6 meters). The width ranges from 35 feet (10.7 meters) to 45 feet (13.7 meters) to accommodate two tracks. Other construction would involve lowering existing BNSF yard tracks and the Amtrak lead track to gain clearance where the Run-Through Trestle crosses over the existing tracks. The Run-Through tracks would reach grade level of the BNSF yard under the 1st Street bridge with a clearance to the bridge of approximately 20 feet (6.1 meters).

Section 106 Analysis

Under Section 106, only Criteria of Adverse Effect examples *iv* and *v* warrant discussion with regard to the 1st Street Bridge.

Criteria example *iv*-Change of use or setting: The 1st Street Bridge would still be used to carry vehicular traffic over rail traffic; therefore, there would be no change in use of the property. No physical alteration to the 1st Street Bridge itself would occur; however, some trackwork would occur where the BNSF tracks pass under the bridge structure. The BNSF tracks, ties, and ballast constitute "physical features within the setting" of the 1st Street Bridge, but they have been subject to regular replacement over the years as part of routine maintenance, and are not historic material that contribute to the significance of the 1st Street Bridge.

Criteria example *v*-Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements: Atmospheric and audible elements would continue to be generated by train traffic under and vehicular traffic over the 1st Street Bridge, with no demonstrable change from current conditions. The visual

introduction of the MSE wall would start 75 feet (22.9 meters) north of the 1st Street Bridge for Alignment A or 150 feet (45.7 meters) north of the 1st Street Bridge for Alignment A-1, where it would be only 4 feet (1.2 meters) high at those distances. The MSE wall would carry rail traffic, which is consistent with the visual character and historic uses in this area of the setting of the 1st Street Bridge. Therefore, the introduction of the MSE wall would not diminish the integrity of the 1st Street Bridge's significant historic features, which are the materials, design, and workmanship of the reinforced concrete bridge structure. (More information on visual effects to the 1st Street Bridge and visual simulations is provided in the Visual Impacts section (Section 3-17) of this document.

Therefore, under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project's effects on the 1st Street Viaduct would result in a finding of "no effect on this historic property."

CEQA Analysis

Under CEQA, the proposed project would not change the present use or otherwise alter the 1st Street Bridge in any way. The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would result in some changes to its setting, but this would be limited to the replacement of non-historic railroad tracks, ties and ballast carried under the bridge. Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a "substantial adverse change in the significance of" the 1st Street Bridge, and would not be a significant effect.

e. Mission Tower

Mission Tower is located at 1436 Alhambra Avenue, a quarter mile from Union Station (APE Map ID #1) From 1916 to 1938, Mission Tower operated at Mission Junction, regulating the railroad traffic at the intersection of the Santa Fe, Union Pacific, and Southern Pacific. Mission Tower is located outside the National Register boundary of Union Station, but was closely associated with the construction and operation of Union Station after the Tower was enlarged in 1938. As a result of the Section 106 process for the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project, and pending SHPO concurrence, Mission Tower would be determined eligible for the National Register under Criterion A, for its association with the development and operation of the Santa Fe Railway in Los Angeles and with Union Station, and under Criterion C, as an example of a Spanish Colonial Revival railroad switching tower. After it is formally determined eligible for the National Register, it would be automatically listed in the California Register.

No construction or track work would be done in the area near Mission Tower for the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project. The Run-Through tracks would return to grade, and be joined with existing tracks, in the Throat area before reaching Alhambra Avenue, and well before reaching the Mission Tower area. Mission Tower was taken out of service in 1996, and the construction and implementation of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would not affect its current use.

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

Under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project's effects on Mission Tower would result in a finding of "no effect on this historic property." Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a "substantial adverse change in the significance of" Mission Tower, and would not be a significant effect.

f. Car Supply/Repair Shop

The Car Supply/Repair Shop, built in 1939, is a contributing feature of and is within the boundary of the National Register-listed property. It is located near the northeast corner of the platform and track area (at the northwest corner of Avila Street and Cesar E. Chavez Avenue (formerly Macy Street). The Car Supply/Repair Shop was constructed directly next to Track 17, a dedicated storage track at Union Station with no passenger access. This is where train car repairs and service could be made without disrupting passenger train service at Union Station. By the early 1980s Track 17 was removed and paved over with asphalt. Tracks 16, 15 and 14, which were located just west of Track 17, also ran very near to the Car Supply/Repair Shop. In 1989-1991, as a result of the construction of the MTA Red Line station and tunnel, Tracks 14, 15 and 16 were removed and passenger platforms 7 and 8 were decommissioned. Subsequently, Tracks 14, 15 and 16 were paved over and the current Amtrak mail transfer facility was constructed on the northern sections of Platform Nos. 7 and 8. The paved area next to the Car Supply/Repair Shop serves as mail truck loading, parking, and other vehicle parking. The proposed project would involve the demolition of the Amtrak mail transfer facility, the reconstruction and re-activation of passenger Platform Nos. 7 and 8 and the re-installation of Tracks 14, 15 and 16 for rail passenger service. These proposed changes would represent a return of railroad use setting to this part of the platform and track area and would have a beneficial effect on the historic setting of the Car Supply/Repair Shop.

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

Under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project's effects on the Car Supply/Repair Shop would result in a finding of "no effect on this historic property." Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a "substantial adverse change in the significance of" the Car Supply/Repair Shop, and would not be a significant effect.

g. AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices

The AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices (AT&SF Offices) are located at 2550 Butte Street, approximately 50 feet (15.2 meters) to the rear of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility, the operations of which would be relocated from Union Station.

The AT&SF Offices are set well back from Washington Street, in an area with railroad and industrial character. The proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility would be constructed between the AT&SF Offices and Washington Street, and would obscure some views of the building. No direct physical alterations to the AT&SF Offices would be required. Views to the building from

within its railroad yard setting from the Redondo Junction Tower and site of the former AT&SF Roundhouse would remain unobstructed and unaffected by the construction of the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility. The railroad setting would not be affected, and views to the building from within its historic yard setting would not be obstructed

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

Under Section 106, application of the Criteria for Adverse Effect to the proposed project's effects on the AT&SF Offices would result in a finding of "no effect on this historic property." Under CEQA, the proposed project would not result in a "substantial adverse change in the significance of" the AT&SF Offices, and would not be a significant effect.

3-5.2.4 Historic Properties for Which There is a Potentially Adverse Effect under Section 106 and a Potentially Significant Effect under CEQA

a. CA-LAN-1575/H

CA-LAN-1575/H is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, under Section 106, Criterion D, as an archaeological site that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Similarly, this property is eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources, for the same reasons. In the past, construction within the boundaries of CA-LAN-1575/H has encountered intact prehistoric and historic components that have yielded important and significant scientific information. A portion of a Native American cemetery on this site is considered sacred to the Gabrieleno Tongva. Portions of the historical component and the Native American cemetery were removed after data-recovery excavations during construction of the MWD headquarters, the MTA facilities, and Union Station, but additional deposits likely exist in other portions of CA-LAN-1575/H. The integrity of these components has varied from excellent to poor, depending on prior historic-era impacts.

The proposed construction and subsequent operation of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project within the boundaries of CA-LAN-1575/H would be essentially identical for Alternative A or Alternative A-1, so only a single discussion of effects is presented below. The impact criteria for Section 106 and CEQA are not identical, but since the Section 106 criteria are more detailed, the effects analysis presented below, follows the Section 106 criteria, but whenever possible, addresses both Section 106 and CEQA in a common discussion.

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

Track re-alignments may result in exposure of cultural resources. This is a concern within CA-LAN-1575/H, an extensive site surrounding Union Station, which is known to contain human remains. Within this site, in an area north of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Headquarters building, a subterranean baggage-handling road is proposed immediately adjacent to an area where human remains were recovered in 1996. However, ballast and sterile fill under existing tracks may be of sufficient depth to protect buried cultural remains

within the Union Station area. Construction of the aerial structure at the south end of the Union Station yard will pierce this deep ballast and fill layer.

The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project includes construction that occurs within the boundaries of CA-LAN-1575/H. However, deep deposits of fill and railroad ballast prevent any assessment of the presence or absence of cultural deposits that may be encountered during construction, or their integrity. Disturbing intact cultural deposits within CA-LAN-1575/H, whether additional portions of the prehistoric cemetery, other prehistoric materials, or historical deposits, would be considered an Adverse Effect. Applicable to CA-LAN-1575/H would be impacts due to physical destruction, whether by construction or by archaeological recovery.

The Section 106 impact criterion is: Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property.

The CEQA impact criterion for demolition is: The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project: Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources.

The physical removal and destruction of burials, artifacts and features at CA-LAN-1575/H, if found in settings that retain integrity, would result in an *adverse effect finding under Section 106* and a *significant effect under CEQA*.

In a letter dated January 15, 2004, the SHPO concurred with the potential for an adverse effect finding on CA-LAN-1575/H, as follows:

“The [Finding of Effect] FOE documentation concludes there is a high potential that CA-LAN-1575/H, AE-UPT-01, and possibly other as yet unknown archaeological deposits may all be subject to adverse effects during construction of this undertaking. It does appear that there is a potential for an adverse effect to these properties should they be determined or considered National Register eligible.”

~~“The documentation states the property appears eligible to the National Register under Criterion D because it may yield information about the materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. The report does not include a research design that explains the information this property may contain, nor does it contain an explanation of why understanding more about materials and location of industrial lead tracks is considered important in any specific historic context. Absent this information, I, at this time, am unable to concur in this eligibility determination.”~~

Subsequent to this letter, a *Draft Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered During Project Implementation* was prepared to address potential effects to historic properties and proposed procedures for addressing known sites with high potential and for previously unknown deposits. This document will be submitted for review by ~~has been developed for submission to~~ the SHPO. The proposed procedures in ~~are~~ consistent with past procedures that have been approved by the SHPO.

b. Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Siding (19-003169)

Remains of a siding of the Southern California/AT&SF were found within the Project APE, and were assigned a project designation 19-003169. This historical archaeological site is potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, under Criterion D, as an archaeological site that may be likely to yield information important in history. Similarly, this property is eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources, for the same reasons.

In a letter dated January 15, 2004, SHPO was unable to concur with this eligibility finding and stated:

“The documentation states the property appears eligible to the National Register under Criterion D because it may yield information about the materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. The report does not include a research design that explains the information this property may contain, nor does it contain an explanation of why understanding more about materials and location of industrial lead tracks is considered important in any specific historic context. Absent this information, I, at this time, am unable to concur in this eligibility determination.”

As noted earlier, the SHPO is correct in stating that a research design regarding historic railroads and railroad features has not been prepared, and lacking this context, it is difficult to evaluate railroad resources. The proposed eligibility evaluation for 19-003169 presented here is cautious, in case such sites do provide information as part of a larger universe of historic-era railroad-related research issues.”

Further study is necessary because a complete evaluation of the resource’s integrity and significance cannot be performed prior to construction.

Section 106 and CEQA Analysis

The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project includes construction that may occur within the boundaries of site 19-003169. South of U.S. 101, construction of the aerial structure will disturb areas within city blocks likely to contain cultural materials. The aerial structures may affect 19-003169, the AT&SF siding in and near Commercial Street, which would have to be evaluated for National Register eligibility at the start of construction. Disturbing intact cultural elements of this site, both known and buried railroad related materials would be considered an Adverse Effect if 19-003169 is found to be eligible for the National Register. Applicable to site 19-003169 would be impacts due to physical destruction, whether by construction or by archaeological recovery.

The Section 106 impact criterion is: Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property.

The CEQA impact criterion for demolition is: The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project: Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources. If this site is determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the physical removal and destruction of artifacts and features at 19-003169, if found in settings that retain integrity, would result in an adverse effect finding under Section 106 and a significant effect under CEQA. If it is found not to be eligible for the National Register nor the California Register, there would be no effect under Section 106 and CEQA. Mitigation measures to address this potential impact are described in Section 3-5.3.

c. Undiscovered Historic Properties for Which There is a Potential Adverse Effect

Previously unknown archaeological sites may be present within the Project APE. For example, construction of the trestle segment along the west bank of the Los Angeles River has the potential to encounter cultural resources beneath currently paved parking lots or under existing railroad ballast. Construction of the trestle to carry the aerial tracks would include drilling piles which also may encounter cultural resources. Construction of the relocated Amtrak mail transfer facility has the potential to encounter buried cultural resources. Since these unknown sites may possess integrity and may yield important or significant scientific information, they could be eligible for the National Register and the California Register. If destruction of these as yet unknown sites occurs due to Project construction, there would be an *adverse effect finding under Section 106* and a *significant effect under CEQA*, for each presently undiscovered but eligible site. Mitigation measures to address this potential impact are described in Section 3-5.3.

3-5.2.5 Historic Properties for Which There Would Be No Adverse Effect Under Section 106 and CEQA

Consideration of project impacts and application of the Section 106 criteria result in identification of one property, Union Station, where there would be physical changes to the historic property, but the changes would result in a finding of “No Adverse Effect” under Section 106 and CEQA.

The proposed project would require modification of portions of the Union Station property, specifically at the passenger platform area, passenger ramps and tunnels, south service road, and south retaining wall. The vast majority of these portions of Union Station, however, were previously altered or destroyed and reconstructed. To better understand the nature of project effects at Union Station, a discussion is first provided of the character-defining features of the overall historic property, followed by an assessment of the existing integrity of the portions of the property that would be affected.

a. Character-Defining Features

The National Register nomination form of Union Station prepared in 1980 devotes the vast majority of its discussion to the description and significance of the main passenger terminal buildings, but the boundary included the entire complex. The basis of significance of Union Station is both for its historical association with the development of railroad transportation in Los Angeles, California, and the United States; for the historical consolidation of the three major railroads into a single terminal; and for the quality of its architectural design. No mention was made in the nomination of several of the structures and buildings within the National Register boundary that are also in this project’s APE, including Terminal Tower, the Vignes Street Overcrossing, the Macy Street Overcrossing, and the Car Supply/Repair Shop. For the purposes of the Section 106 process for the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project, these buildings and structures are considered to be listed in the National Register as part of Union Station because they fall within the boundary and were built within the property’s period of significance. As discussed above, there would be no effect or no adverse effect on these structures and buildings, but they are in close proximity to the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project.

The National Register nomination does describes some character-defining features within the APE, including service areas and pedestrian platforms, canopies, ramps and tunnels as follows, quoted in relevant part:

“Also in the upper level, and over the pedestrian islands between the railroad tracks, are Y-shaped sheds consisting of corrugated-iron panels supported by steel columns, both of which are badly rusted and in need of cleaning and painting. These sheds provide protection from the sun and the rain and are expected to continue to be needed as long as the tracks are used for passenger trains.

“The facilities above described have no special aesthetic value and are historical only to the extent that they served a utilitarian function as part of the overall station, when it was in full operation. However, their location is such that any new development that takes place in their vicinity needs to be carefully designed so as to blend in with the significant portion of the station, both aesthetically and functionally. That is the main reason they have been included in the nomination...

“Santa Fe favored [the design of] a through terminal; the Union Station plan, however, was to create a stub-end terminal with all three lines [Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, and Santa Fe] consolidated on a short, dead-end trackage system. The operational disadvantages of utilizing this type of system was a major objection of the railroad companies. The stub-end system created an end-of-the-line station with the tracks ending at bumpers... The LAUPT plan placed the main passenger terminal building at the side of the stub-end track network, with a series of ramps and an underground passage connecting the platforms with the waiting room...

“The three major railroad lines were brought together over a set of throat tracks, with a carefully designed arrangement of turn-outs, cross-overs and double slip switches which permitted trains of each company to be routed to any track in the station at any time. The trains were shunted onto 16 tracks. Eight double ramps lead from the platforms to a subterranean tunnel which leads to the main waiting room...

“The main architectural focus of the complex is the passenger station itself. The support facilities for baggage and parcel shipment immediately behind it are more utilitarian in appearance. The terminal complex is bordered by retaining walls on the north and south sides which reflect the Art Deco influences in the 1930’s design... The 500-foot pedestrian subway connects the main terminal building with the tracks; it is integrated structurally and visually into the design, using linear bands of subdued colors to unite the two areas... Light fixtures of the 1930’s period are placed in the ceiling leading to the eight sets of double ramps rising to the platforms between the tracks; the platforms are surmounted by the original butterfly sheds.”¹

Three key points drawn from the National Register nomination for Union Station should be taken into consideration when reading the impacts analysis presented in subsection C:

1. The main passenger terminal buildings are the character-defining features from which the significance of Union Station is derived and recognized.

¹ Lovret, Ruben. Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal. National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form, received by the National Park Service on August 7, 1979, and entered on November 13, 1980. Quoted excerpts are from item 7 page 3 and supplemental information pages 1-2.

2. A run-through, or double end, track design was originally considered when Union Station was being planned in the 1930s.
3. The passenger platforms and canopies were considered to have “no aesthetic value” and were mainly included so that “any new development that takes place in their vicinity needs to be carefully designed so as to blend in with the significant portion of the station, both aesthetically and functionally.”

b. Assessment of Existing Integrity

The National Register criteria state that to be eligible, a property must “possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.” The California Register lists “integrity” as one of the criteria for eligibility, and defines it, in part, as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.” To understand impacts, one must understand how the original integrity of a property would be changed by the proposed project. Since Union Station was listed in the National Register in 1980, considerable changes have occurred to those features and areas that would be used and modified to accommodate construction of the proposed project including: the south retaining wall, south baggage handling service road, and the passenger platforms, canopies, ramps, and tunnels. These changes warrant further discussion so that the reader may understand that the portions of Union Station that would be modified by the proposed project have already been modified from their 1939 appearance (see Figure 3-5.12). The following discussion provides a chronological account of projects that have been undertaken in and around the Union Station platforms and track area since the 1980 National Register listing, and a description of the alterations that resulted from their construction in the proposed project location.

El Monte Busway - 1987


The El Monte Busway Extension project was constructed in 1987 to accommodate westbound bus traffic along a roadway between the U.S. 101 and the Union Station property to Alameda Street. Because there was not adequate room for the busway, the southern end of the Union Station property was acquired, and the southern end of the Union Station platform area was demolished (see Figure 3-5.13). Through a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the State Office of Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the original south concrete retaining wall was demolished and reconstructed to replicate the original design and materials, including pilasters, parapet and balustrade. The new south retaining wall was built in a slight diagonal configuration, running northeast. Existing luminaries and pendant lanterns were salvaged and reused. The tracks, platforms and canopies were shortened at the south end, but were reconstructed to maintain the same basic relationship to each other. In addition, the baggage/service road located between the retaining wall and the platform/track area had to be realigned. The south vehicular ramp, Railway Express Agency building, and garage were also partially demolished and shortened for the El Monte Busway.

MTA Red Line - 1991


Completed in 1991, the MTA Red Line subway tunnel and station were constructed with cut-and-cover construction in a diagonal direction running northwest to southeast directly through the Union Station

passenger platform area and tracks² (see Figure 3-5.14). The cut-and-cover construction involved the demolition of the central section of the tracks, platforms, access ramps and associated concrete railings, as well as the central section of the subterranean passenger access tunnel linking the platforms to the terminal building. Also as part of the Red Line construction, the north vehicle access ramp, part of the architecturally integrated north retaining wall facing Macy Street and the north end of the Mail, Baggage and Express building were demolished. These latter changes, however, did not affect the platform and track area. Because the Red Line was constructed on a diagonal, it caused varying amounts of demolition and subsequent reconstruction to the existing canopies, platforms, ramps, and passenger tunnel.

² The description is based on review of a site plan dated November 1989 and on aerial photographs of the cut-and-cover construction of the Metro Rail Red Line subway station and tunnel at Union Station taken in April 1991. Although undertaken by the RTD/MTA, the alterations at the platform level were specified for Metrolink SCRRA.




Aerial view in 1951 of Union Station. Originally, there were 6 baggage platforms (A-1 and A-E) and 17 passenger platforms (1-17) with 8 full length butterfly canopies for the passenger platforms.



Aerial view in 2002 of Union Station tracks. Note: There are now only 10 platforms and 5 shortened and reconstructed canopies. The south end of the property (left of frame) was truncated in 1987 for the El Monte Busway and the retaining wall was reconstructed. The east end of the platform level (bottom of frame) was altered by the construction of the MTA Gateway Complex in 1995. The red line denotes the approximate historic boundary of the Union Station primary platforms and access ramps.


Figure 3-5.12: Aerial Comparison



El Monte Busway, 1987

Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-5.13: El Monte Busway 1987



MTA Red Line Construction, 1989-90

Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-5.14: MTA Red Line 1989-90

The Red Line construction was undertaken in accordance with a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, which required the reconstructed areas to be replicated in-kind or be compatible in design with the original features that were demolished.

❑ **Baggage Tracks, Platforms, and Canopies**

The five baggage tracks and associated platforms and canopies that were located between the passenger platforms and the service buildings were demolished in the early 1980s.

❑ **Passenger Tunnel**

The central section of the passenger tunnel was demolished and re-constructed in 1991-92 under conditions set out in the MTA Red Line MOA. After the cut-and-cover construction of the Red Line station was completed, the passenger tunnel was reconstructed to match the existing original sections. The floor of the tunnel was rebuilt with poured concrete, colored to match the existing sections. The original tile wainscot lining the walls of the tunnel extended approximately two-thirds up the wall with smooth painted concrete above. This tile was removed throughout the entire tunnel including the existing sections and replaced with tile of similar size and color. However, the replacement tile wainscot was installed to a height lower than the original. The ceiling of the tunnel was recreated in certain sections. The sections running under the tracks were reconstructed in the original configuration and shape while the sections running under the platforms were constructed with large raised open ceilings with exposed structural concrete beams and rectangular glass block skylights centrally located in the platform overhead. The exception to this is where the tunnel runs under Platform No. 6 and under former Platform Nos. 7 and 8, where it is still in its original shape and configuration.

The openings to the passenger platform access ramps located along the north wall of the tunnel were widened and recessed into the wall to create a tapered throat into the ramps. One exception is the opening to the northern ramp of Platform No. 6 (serving Tracks 11 and 12), which is still in its original 1939 configuration. The openings along the south wall were also reconstructed with the same width as the openings on the north but open into completely reconfigured passageways.

❑ **Passenger Ramps**

As a result of Red Line construction, passenger ramps were changed. Both the northern and southern ramps to Platform No. 1 were completely demolished. The northern ramp to Platform No. 2 with its decorative railings was completely demolished and reconstructed in kind.

The southern passenger ramps, to Platform Nos. 2 through 6 were completely demolished and reconstructed in a new configuration to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines. The ramp entrances off the main passenger tunnel were widened to accommodate flights of stairs that lead to the platforms. Beyond the stairs, the ramps were extended in length and reconstructed with a lesser slope to meet ADA guidelines. Although elongated, the southern ramp railings were reconstructed to match the design and materials of the original existing decorative concrete ramp railings found on most of the northern ramps. The southern passenger ramps to Platform Nos. 7 and 8 along with their decorative concrete railings were completely demolished and not re-constructed. The

entrances to these ramps were sealed off at the passenger tunnel, since the ramps do not link to passenger platforms.

The southern section of the northern ramp to Platform No. 3 was demolished and re-constructed along with a lower section of its decorative concrete railing. However, the upper section was retained and was saw-cut to fit the newly re-created section (see Figure 3-5.15).

The northern ramp to Platform No. 4 was also partially demolished but to a lesser degree than the northern ramp to Platform No. 3, with only a small lower section being removed. The upper section beyond this was retained, and saw-cut to match the new section.

The northern ramps to Platform Nos. 5 and 6 along with their decorative railings were retained in place.

□ Platforms

Platform No. 1 was completely demolished along with its north and south passenger access ramps and a new platform in a new configuration was recently constructed for the MTA Gold Line project (see Gold Line below).

A majority of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 were demolished and re-constructed. Platform Nos. 4 through 6 were partially demolished and re-constructed but retain much of their original 1939 concrete materials.


The southern sections of Platform Nos. 7 and 8 were completely demolished and Tracks 14, 15, and 16 were completely removed within the station area. This area was paved at-grade with asphalt and currently serves as truck and vehicle parking associated with mail operations. A one-story mail-handling platform and shed were constructed along the northern section of Platform No. 7. The Amtrak mail transfer facility is currently serviced by Track No. 13. The decorative concrete railings of the northern ramps to Platform Nos. 7 and 8 have deteriorated, but still remain in fairly original condition.

□ Canopies

During construction of the Red Line the corrugated metal butterfly canopies located over Platforms Nos. 1 and 2 were completely removed and stored. The canopies over Platform Nos. 7 and 8 were also completely removed. Only limited sections of the canopies over Platforms Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 were removed during construction (see Figure 3-5.16). After reconstruction of the platforms and ramps was completed, the canopies that had been removed from Platform Nos. 2 and 3 were re-installed but shortened at the north and south ends, while the sections of removed canopies from Platform Nos. 4, 5 and 6 were re-installed to their original length. Some small sections of the canopies that were removed during the MTA Red Line construction were discarded due to damage or deterioration. Canopies appear to have been infilled/patched with original sections of canopies, possibly sections re-located from Platform Nos. 7 or 8. It appears that only a few very small sections of canopy have been in filled with new corrugated metal cladding.



Figure 3-5.15: Ramp to Platform No. 3 After Red Line Construction



CONSTRUCTION OF the Los Angeles Metro Rail subway is evident in this April 1991 aerial view, which shows the diagonal path of the cut-and-cover subway cutting across all the tracks. The removed trainshed roofs have been stacked at the left for possible reuse. Alameda Street runs across the upper half of the photo; Los Angeles Street turns sharply and crosses Alameda to access the depot. Visible between the tracks and the depot is the new Amtrak building which includes ticketing and baggage facilities as well as office space. **Bruce Jones**

108

Source: Bill Bradley, *The Last of the Great Stations*

Figure 3-5.16: Red Line Excavation 1991

Metrolink – 1993

Physical changes to the passenger platform area at Union Station as a result of a 1993 Metrolink project were relatively minor. These consisted of the installation of directional signs and related concrete support bases in the center of the platforms; installation of concrete bases and enclosures for electrical panels in the center of the platforms; replacement of original lighting fixtures on the underside of the canopies with new contemporary style fixtures; and installation of raised platform sections for disabled access to trains located at the southern end of Platforms Nos. 2 and 4. In addition, the butterfly canopies were extended on the north ends by approximately 5 feet (1.5 meters).

MTA Gateway Center – 1995


The MTA Gateway Center and east portal construction caused the demolition of the southern half of Platform Nos. 7 and 8. The east portal dome structure was constructed to accommodate the future replacement of Track 16 by projecting out over it. The edge of the dome was supported by two columns constructed in the former location of Platform No. 8. Tracks 14, 15 and 16 were de-commissioned and removed. The east end of the passenger tunnel that originally dead ended east of the access ramps to Platform No. 8 was opened up to connect with the east portal lobby, which provides access to the Red Line subway station and to MTA buses at Patsouras Transit Center.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) Headquarters Building – 1996

Construction of the MWD building caused the demolition of the southern vehicle ramp and south service wing of Union Station, both of which had already been altered and partially demolished by the El Monte Busway (see Figure 3-5.17). The southern vehicle ramp was reconstructed to the east of its original location. No changes were made to the platforms or tracks as a result of this construction.

Los Angeles Union Station TEA 21 Improvements – 2001

Project-related changes were primarily limited to the interior of the passenger tunnel. The tile wainscoting lining the walls of the tunnel was topped by a new Art Deco style decorative trim and new lighting sconces were installed along the upper portion of the tunnel walls.



Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-5.17: Additional Projects


Gold Line – 2003

The MTA Gold Line introduced an elevated platform, elevated guideway, and a different style passenger shelter at Union Station. The Gold Line platform was constructed in basically the same position as the original Platform No. 1 (serving Tracks 1 and 2) but wider and at a higher elevation, approximately 2 to 3 feet (.6 meters to .9 meters), in order to match the light rail transit vehicle height. The northern pedestrian access ramp that serviced Platform No. 1 was demolished and a new considerably wider entry area with elevator and stairs was constructed in its place. The southern access ramp was demolished and never rebuilt. None of the original metal butterfly canopy was reinstalled on Platform No. 1. New waiting shelters with associated benches, railings, lighting standards and other furniture designed in a modern Victorian revival style were installed. In the future, the Gold Line will be extended south in a run-through configuration on its own bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 as part of the Eastside LRT project.

Remaining Integrity

In addition to the above changes, tracks, switches, ties, and ballast are regularly replaced as part of routine maintenance at Union Station, most recently in 1993. The changes that have occurred at Union Station are summarized on Figure 3-5.18, which illustrates the areas of the property that retain integrity. Of utmost importance is that the main passenger terminal buildings continue to retain all aspects of integrity, so that the property continues to retain the characteristics that qualified it for listing in the National Register in 1980. The platforms, canopies, ramps, and tunnels have been modified in subsequent years to accommodate different service functions and technologies associated with passenger transportation at Union Station. Despite these changes, the relationship of passenger to train is still conveyed in essentially the same manner as 1939—the passengers still wait under butterfly canopies for the trains to slip in and out between the concrete platforms, and gain access to the terminal by a series of ramps and tunnels. These changes also created a beneficial effect. After a slow period in the 1970s when it was underutilized, Union Station has re-emerged as Los Angeles' primary passenger transportation center.

In summary, Union Station's platforms, canopies, ramps, and tunnels have lost some integrity of design, materials, and workmanship, but they have retained integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association. The fact that Los Angeles Union Station continues to function primarily as a train station is perhaps its most important historic character-defining feature. This is a rare situation today because many historic railroad stations across the nation have been put out of service, or converted to other uses.



Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-5.18: Remaining Historic Fabric

c. Application of the Impact Criteria

The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project includes construction that occurs on or adjacent to the Union Station National Register-listed property, including: track and platform changes; passenger accessibility improvements; and a bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The proposed construction and subsequent operation would be essentially identical at Union Station for Alternative A or Alternative A-1, so only a single discussion of effects is presented below. The impact criteria for Section 106 and CEQA are not identical, but several parallel criteria may be addressed with the same effects analysis. Therefore, the effects analysis presented below follows the more detailed Section 106 criteria, but whenever possible, addresses both Section 106 and CEQA in a common discussion.

Demolition Impacts

The Section 106 impact criteria for demolition is: Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property.

The CEQA impact criteria for demolition is: The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project: Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources.

□ Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Associated Ramps

The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would involve demolition and reconstruction of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6, and reconstructing them at an elevation approximately five feet higher than existing. The north ramp of Platform No. 2 (which was demolished in 1991 by the Red Line project) and Platform No. 3 (which was partially demolished in 1991 by the Red Line project) would be demolished and reconstructed in a similar configuration to the existing ADA compliant southern ramps, but would be extended to account for the new platform height. The changes to Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would include the walls, and decorative concrete railings of the northern ramps. The southern ramps would also be demolished and re-constructed in an extended configuration to account for the raised platform. The southern ramps were previously completely demolished and reconstructed in 1991 (see Figure 3-5.19). The work at Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would require the temporary removal of the butterfly canopies and their support columns, but they would not be demolished. After construction of the platforms is completed, the canopies would either be re-installed or re-created in kind and would be extended at the northern and southern ends with new sections to match existing.




Figure 3-5.19: Red Line Excavation - Platform View

An overwhelming majority of the existing pavement of Platform No. 2 is not historic fabric, being re-constructed in 1989 as part of the Red Line station below. Platform No. 2 may retain a few minor sections of original concrete paving at the extreme southern and northern portions, but this is negligible when taking into consideration the total amount of original concrete paving that was demolished for Red Line construction and replaced with new paving. The northern and southern passenger access ramps serving Platform No. 2 were completely demolished and re-constructed for the Red Line construction.

The demolition of Platform No. 2 and its northern and southern ramps would result in *no adverse effect under Section 106* and *no significant effect under CEQA* because so little historic materials remain from the 1939 period of significance of the National Register-listed property.

Platform No. 3 was also partially demolished during the Red Line construction. However, a much greater degree of original platform pavement survives, especially north of the north ramp where a portion dating to 1939 remains.

The demolition of the north portion of Platform No. 3 and the north portion of its northern ramp would result in a *potentially adverse effect under Section 106* and a *significant effect under CEQA* because it would result in demolition of some historic materials that date to the 1939 period of significance of the National Register-listed property. The southern portion of the platform, the southern portion of the north ramp, and the southern ramp are reconstructions dating to 1991, and their demolition would not be an adverse or significant effect.

Tracks 3, 4, 5, and 6 and their associated ties and ballast were all reconstructed after Red Line construction was completed in 1991. Therefore they are not historic materials and their demolition and reconstruction would have *no effect* under Section 106 and CEQA.

The butterfly canopies on Platforms No. 2 and 3 would be disassembled for cleaning and either re-installed or replaced after construction. Where the canopies are re-installed, the result would be a *no adverse effect finding under Section 106* and *no significant effect under CEQA*. However where canopies were to be replaced, they would be replaced in-kind and in accordance with the Secretary's Standards to avoid resulting in an *adverse effect under Section 106* and a *significant effect under CEQA*. This is because, in the absence of following the Secretary's Standards, the action would result in demolition of historic materials that date to the 1939 period of significance of the National Register-listed property.

□ Platform Nos. 7 and 8

Decommissioned Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would be re-constructed and Tracks 14 through 16 would be reinstalled and reactivated for passenger rail use. The southern passenger access ramps for Platform Nos. 7 and 8 that were removed by 1991 would be re-constructed to match the existing southern ramps of Platforms Nos. 2 through 6. The original northern passenger access ramps and railings remain; however, these would also be demolished and re-constructed to match the existing ADA-compliant southern ramps. The demolition of the northern ramps and railings at Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would result in a *potentially adverse effect under Section 106* and a *potentially significant effect under CEQA* because it would result in demolition of historic materials that date to the 1939 period of significance of the National Register-listed property. The reactivation of passenger rail service to currently decommissioned Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would be a beneficial effect on the historic property because it

would restore the historic function of these decommissioned platforms and tracks. The northern ramps and railings would be reconstructed according to the Secretary's Standards in their new ADA compliant configuration, this mitigation, coupled with the beneficial effect resulting from the reactivation of passenger rail service, would reduce the effect on Platform Nos. 7 and 8 to "no adverse" under Section 106 and "less than significant" under CEQA.

Alteration Impacts

The Section 106 impact criteria for alteration is: Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines;

The CEQA impact criteria for alteration is: The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project: Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources.

□ Platform Nos. 2 and 3

One of the primary changes to the existing configuration of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would occur at the southern end of the platform area. Here the platforms would be slightly curved in a southeasterly direction to follow the curved track alignment and approach to the proposed bridge across the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The MTA Gold Line project has already introduced an elevated curved guideway at the north end of Platform No. 1, and the Eastside LRT extension will be constructing an elevated curved guideway at the south end of Platform No. 1, which also would include a new bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. Because the south ends of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 were rebuilt for Red Line in 1991, and because of the existing and proposed Gold Line curved guideways, the alteration of the original design of the south ends of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 from straight to curved would result in a *no adverse effect under Section 106* and a *less than significant effect under CEQA*.

□ Butterfly Canopies

As discussed above, the corrugated metal butterfly canopies on Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be disassembled for cleaning and either re-installed or re-placed after construction of the new raised Platform Nos. 2 and 3 were completed. The butterfly canopies on Platform No. 2 were removed during construction of the Red Line and although some of the removed sections were discarded, the existing sections were re-installed and filled in where necessary, most likely with original sections of canopy that had been previously removed from Platform Nos. 7 and 8. Some of the canopies contain small sections of new corrugated metal cladding. These sections were installed in-kind and appear to have been done in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.

The proposed project calls for the canopy over Platform No. 2 to be extended on the north by approximately 135 feet (41.4 meters) and approximately 22 feet (6.7 meters) on the south. The canopy over Platform No. 3 would be extended on the north by approximately 58 feet (17.6 meters) and by approximately 22 feet (6.7 meters) on the south. Although the extension of the canopies would be an alteration from their existing condition, the canopies were previously shortened by earlier projects, so

the extension would restore the portions of the canopies that had previously been removed (see Figure 3-5.20 and Figure 3-5.21). Since the extension would be done in accordance with the Secretary's Standards, it would result in *no adverse effect under Section 106* and *no significant effect under CEQA*. The restoration of previously removed portions would have a beneficial effect on the historic property.

□ **Service Road**


The Service Road along the south end of the tracks at Union Station was demolished, shifted to the north, and re-aligned on an angle in 1987 as a result of the construction of the El Monte Busway. Because of these changes, the service road does not have integrity of location, materials, design, or workmanship dating to 1939. It does have integrity of setting, feeling, and association because it is still at-grade and it maintains its relationship to the south end of the tracks. A set of stairs would be constructed at the southern end of Platform Nos. 2 through 6 to provide access to the proposed lower level and depressed baggage road and baggage storage area. The alteration of the Service Road by the introduction of the stairs and lower level would change the spatial relationship between the Service Road and the tracks, and is not compatible with the original design of the Service Road, which would not be consistent with the Secretary's Standards. However, because the Service Road was moved and re-built in 1987, the further alteration of the Service Road design would result in *no adverse effect under Section 106* and a *less than significant effect under CEQA*.

□ **South Retaining Wall**

The South Retaining Wall along the south end of the Union Station property was demolished, shifted to the north, and re-aligned on an angle in 1987 as a result of the construction of the El Monte Busway. Therefore, it does not have integrity of location, materials, or workmanship dating to 1939. It does have integrity of design, setting, feeling, and association because it was reconstructed to replicate the original appearance in accordance with a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement. The proposed project would require alteration of the South Retaining Wall by removing a portion of the balustrade to accommodate the bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. Because the South Retaining Wall was moved and re-built in 1987, the further alteration of the South Retaining Wall and balustrade would result in *no adverse effect under Section 106* and a *less than significant effect under CEQA*, since the alterations and new construction would be designed in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.


Relocation Impacts

The Section 106 impact criteria for relocation is: Removal of the property from its historic location.



Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-5.20: Canopy Plan, 1939



Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-5.21: Canopy Plan, 2003

The CEQA impact criteria for relocation is: Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

With the exception of the canopies discussed under Alteration Impacts above, no portion of Union Station would be removed or relocated as part of this project. The canopies would be reinstalled in the original locations from which they were removed, which would have *no effect under Section 106 or CEQA*.

Change of Use or Setting

The Section 106 impact criteria for change of use or setting is: Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;

The CEQA impact criteria for change of use or setting is: Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

Union Station has always been a railroad passenger terminal, and that historic use would not be changed as a result of implementation of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project. The design that was originally utilized for Union Station was for a stub-end terminal. That is, trains would enter, come to a stop, and exit in the reverse direction. The proposed project would change this function, by allowing trains on Tracks 3, 4, 5 and 6 to continue through the station without reversing direction. This would change the operation of the terminal from a stub end to a through terminal, but the overall function as a train station would not be changed. The through tracks would alter the setting of the property because a bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 would be added at the south end of the historic property. It should be noted that when Union Station was being planned in the 1930s, designs were made for a through-terminal operation. Although the through tracks were never built, a historic precedent for through-track operations exists (see Figure 3-5.22). Because Union Station would continue to serve as a railroad passenger terminal and the through-track design has a historic precedent at Union Station, the change in use or setting resulting from the proposed project would result in *no adverse effect under Section 106 and no significant effect under CEQA*.

Impacts from Visual, Atmospheric, or Audible Elements

The Section 106 impact criteria for the visual, atmospheric, or audible elements is: Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features.

There is no analogous CEQA criterion.

PROPOSED DOUBLE END ARRANGEMENT FOR
-LAUPT-



Russell Lee Crump Collection

Although never built, at least one of the original plans for the LAUPT layout featured a double ended design for the terminal. Oddly enough, there is once again talk of double ending the station in order to handle the increased passenger traffic in the region.

54 S A N T I A F O H E R I T A G E

Figure 3-5.22: Historic Plan for Double End or Through Travel

Platform Nos. 2 and 3

Platform Nos. 2 and 3, serving Tracks 3 through 6, would be elevated approximately five feet (1.5 meters) as part of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project. Raising platforms could alter the visual experience of passengers arriving or departing from other platforms at Union Station. The passenger's view point at Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be unchanged when a train pulls in, as the relative distance of the platform and canopy from the train and tracks would remain unchanged; they would be vertically shifted as a unit. Existing views toward the Union Station terminal building and tower from Platform Nos. 4 through 6 may be partially obscured due to the increased height of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and the associated passenger access ramp railings, display signs, and benches. However, these views have already been partially obscured due to the recent reconstruction of Platform No. 1 for the new Gold Line service, which was raised above grade by approximately 2-3 feet (.6-.9 meters). The views toward the station from Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be fairly unobstructed and perhaps slightly better than existing conditions due to their increased height. The only objects that could obstruct sight lines to the station from Platform Nos. 2 and 3 are the Gold Line waiting shelter, light poles, elevator, catenary wires, and other structures located on the Gold Line Platform No. 1.

Views and sight lines from platform to platform and from platform to station are often intermittent due to the presence of trains which block views of passengers while they are in the platform area. The frequency of trains into the station would increase over time due to proposed increases in Metrolink and Amtrak train schedules and the opening of Gold Line service. While these changes may alter the visual characteristics of the property and possibly diminish the integrity of design and feeling within the track and platform area, it would not affect the overall passenger experience of trains pulling in and out of Union Station among multiple platforms.

Because the overall passenger experience would be unchanged, and because the Gold Line has already introduced elevated platforms and elevated guideway at Platform No. 1, the visual change of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 being placed at an elevated height in comparison to other platforms would result in *no adverse effect under Section 106* and a *less than significant effect under CEQA*, if the new design is in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.

Bridge over El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 at the South Retaining Wall

The South Retaining Wall along the south end of the Union Station property was demolished, shifted to the north, and realigned on an angle in 1987 as a result of the construction of the El Monte Busway. Therefore it does not have integrity of location, materials, or workmanship dating to 1939. It does have integrity of design, setting, feeling, and association because it was reconstructed to replicate the original appearance in accordance with a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement. The proposed project would introduce a major visual change in the vicinity of the South Retaining Wall by construction of a bridge through the balustrade and over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101.

The Eastside LRT extension project also includes a bridge that will have similar impacts. Since it will be constructed first, the Eastside LRT extension project will establish a precedent for the railroad bridge. In addition, a through-terminal design for Union Station was considered back in the 1930s, which means such a bridge would be in keeping with an alternative historic design. Because the South Retaining Wall was moved and re-built in 1987, and because the MTA is planning to construct a similar bridge at this location before the proposed project, the visual change caused by the proposed

railroad bridge to the original South Retaining Wall design would result in a *no adverse effect under Section 106* and a *less than significant effect under CEQA*.

In a meeting with the SHPO on December 12, 2002, SHPO recommended that the design of the bridge be compatible yet differentiated from the design and materials of the reconstructed South Retaining Wall, and employ a simple, clean geometry, rather than replicating the appearance of the wall. Such design considerations and further SHPO review would ensure that the design is in accordance with the Secretary's Standards, which would mitigate the visual effect of the proposed Run-Through Tracks bridge to a level less than adverse under Section 106 and less than significant under CEQA. A Memorandum of Agreement to codify these conditions is described in Section 3-5.3.

Impacts Due to Neglect

The Section 106 impact criteria for neglect is: Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization.

There is no analogous CEQA criterion.

The proposed project would facilitate the planned growth in passenger rail traffic to and from Union Station and would not cause a neglect of the property.

Impacts Due to Sale

The Section 106 impact criteria for sale of the property is: Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long term preservation of the property's historic significance.

There is no analogous CEQA criterion.

The Union Station property is not, nor has it ever been, federally owned. Therefore this criterion does not apply.

Finding of Effect

The effects on the National Register-listed Union Station historic property caused by the proposed project would, for the most part, be limited to the platform and track area, and would include demolition and alteration of portions of the passenger platforms and ramps, canopies, passenger tunnels, south retaining wall and baggage service road. Many of these elements have been demolished and reconstructed since the 1980 National Register listing of the property. However, some historic materials from the 1939 period of significance would be affected by the proposed project, but treatment of this fabric would be done in consultation with the SHPO to minimize harm to the overall historic property.

The proposed project would also cause a change in the visual and spatial relationships among platforms, and could affect views of the terminal building and tower from some platforms. All the changes listed above would not directly or indirectly affect the Los Angeles Union Station main terminal building, arcades, patios or landscaping, the primary buildings for which the property was found to be eligible for the National Register. Nor would these changes affect the overall experience of

rail passenger service at Union Station, the property's historic use. These changes would not by themselves diminish the integrity of the property such as to compromise its National Register eligibility. Therefore, these changes to isolated elements would result in a finding of *no adverse effect* under Section 106 and a *less than significant effect* under CEQA for the National Register-listed Union Station property.

In a letter dated January 15, 2004, SHPO concurred with the no adverse effect finding on the Union Station property by stating:

“The proposed project alternatives will not significantly alter or change those characteristics that qualify [this property] for inclusion in the [National Register] NRHP. In addition, numerous alterations that have occurred at Union Station as a result of the El Monte Busway Extension project in 1987 and the Metro Rail [Red] Line project in 1991 have introduced elements that have slightly altered the property's historic design, materials, and setting associated with its 1939 appearance. It is these modified elements that the proposed project is designed to have the greatest impact on.”

Referring to the 1980 National Register nomination for Union Station, the passenger platforms and canopies were considered to have “no aesthetic value” and were mainly included so “that any new development that takes place in their vicinity needs to be carefully designed so as to blend in with the significant portion of the station, both aesthetically and functionally.” To ensure that the design of the proposed project meets these conditions, consultation with the SHPO will be undertaken to minimize harm to the resource, specifically regarding the treatment of the following features and spaces:

- The north portion of Platform No. 3 and the north portion of its northern ramp
- The butterfly canopies that would need to be replaced instead of re-installed, after they are disassembled and construction is completed
- The northern ramps at Platform Nos. 7 and 8
- The design of the south ends of Platform Nos. 2 and 3, which would change from straight to curved
- The Service Road design
- The break in the balustrade and the further alteration of the South Retaining Wall
- The visual change of Platform Nos. 2 and 3
- The visual change caused by the Run-Through Tracks bridge over U.S. 101, which would be located south of the South Retaining Wall.

3-5.2.6 Impacts to Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resource impacts under both Alternative A and Alternative A-1 would be the same because both alternatives involve the nearly identical components and alignments.

a. No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, the Run-Through Tracks project would not be constructed and impacts to paleontological resources would not occur as a result of the proposed project. Other projects

that are planned in close proximity would continue to have the potential to create impacts on paleontological resources.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Under Alternatives A and A-1, the improvements in the LAUS platform area and construction of the relocated Amtrak mail transfer facility are not expected to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources because Recent alluvium underlies this area and Recent alluvium is considered to have a low sensitivity for yielding paleontological resources. In addition, deep excavations into underlying formations are not anticipated as part of construction.

The portions of the project alignments (from the El Monte Busway to north of the 1st Street Bridge) that require the installation of piles deep underground have the potential to occur within older sedimentary deposits that could yield fossil remains of terrestrial or marine species. In addition, because pile excavation will involve auguring and spoils would be removed at the ground surface, any paleontological resource present would be damaged or destroyed and may not be identifiable. Although the older deposits have a high sensitivity for paleontological resources, due to the buried nature of the deposits, it is unknown whether such resources are actually present in the exact location where piles will be constructed. Consequently, there is a potential for significant impacts to paleontological resources, if present.

3-5.3 Potential Mitigation

3-5.3.1 Draft Memorandum of Agreement for Union Station

To ensure that the effects of the proposed project on the Union Station historic property are mitigated to less than significant, FRA and the Department have consulted with the State Historic Preservation Officer ~~would be consulted by FRA, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and interested Native American groups, would be offered an opportunity to participate;~~ and A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) would be drafted that would provide mechanisms to minimize harm to the historic property, primarily through treatment, design review, comment, and design revision. This MOA will stipulate that a *Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered During Project Implementation* ~~Historic Properties Treatment Plan~~ (Treatment Plan HPTP) will be prepared for the Project prior to construction. To more efficiently implement archaeological testing, evaluation, and site mitigation in areas of the Project alignment, which are presently accessible, as discussed below, the ~~HPTP Treatment Plan~~ should would be prepared as soon as possible after signing of the MOA.

In the general context of prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, resolution of potential adverse effect usually involves site avoidance or mitigation through excavation and additional research. In the present case, avoidance is not an option because of the massive nature of the proposed construction, and tight grade and turning constraints. Potential adverse impacts to paleontological resources can be mitigated by measures implemented during the construction process. Implementing the mitigation measures stipulated below will result in compliance with Section 106 regulations regarding assessment and treatment of known cultural resources, as well as assessment and treatment of subsequent cultural resources discoveries during the Project.

a. Archaeological Resources

Alternative A

Mitigation of effects to prehistoric and historical archaeological sites within Alternative A must be approached in two ways, depending on accessibility. First, there are areas within Alternative A where cultural resources identification, evaluation and mitigation, if needed, can occur *prior* to Project construction. These areas include two vacant blocks on the south side of Commercial Street, a small area of vacant land north of the MTA Red Line tunnel portal between Commercial and Ducommun Streets, the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility location, and possibly the Thomas R. Barrabee Store and Warehouse (#10 on the APE map), if demolition can be scheduled to occur several months before construction. Within these areas, site identification, testing and evaluation, and subsequent mitigation through data-recovery or monitoring should occur as specified in Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2, CR-3, CR-4, CR-5 and CR-6 below. Specifically, asphalt and pavement should be removed in and around locations where bent construction or other construction will take place, to allow for archaeological testing by mechanical or manual excavations. This activity should take place months prior to the start of Project construction.

Second, there are areas within Alternative A where cultural resources identification, evaluation and mitigation, if needed, can occur only *during* construction. These areas include the active tracks and yard of Union Station north of U.S. 101, the median of U.S. 101, the active railway tracks of the BNSF yard on the west bank of the Los Angeles River, and other areas of the APE which are currently sealed by modern materials, or are heavily used. Within these areas, monitoring, site location, testing and evaluation, and subsequent mitigation through data recovery or monitoring, should occur as specified in Mitigation Measures CR-6, and CR-5 below, and with reference to standards and procedures specified in CR-1, CR-2, CR-3 and CR-4.

In certain parts of the Project APE, such as in the deep ballast in the Union Station Yard, bent construction may result in impacts to cultural resources that cannot be mitigated prior to or during construction, due to the inaccessibility of the resources beneath the ballast, and the proposed construction technique.

Alternative A-1

Mitigation of effects to prehistoric and historical archaeological sites within Alternative A-1 must be approached in two ways, depending on accessibility. First, there are areas within Alternative A-1 where cultural resources identification, evaluation and mitigation, if needed, can occur *prior* to Project construction. These areas include two vacant blocks on the north side of Commercial Street, adjacent to U.S. 101, vacant land north of the MTA Red Line tunnel portal between Commercial and Ducommun Streets, the proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility location, and possibly the locations of the Friedman Bag Building-Textile Division (#9 on the APE map) and the New York Junk Company building (#8 on the APE map), if demolition can be scheduled to occur several months before construction. Within these areas, site identification, testing and evaluation, and subsequent mitigation through data-recovery or monitoring should occur as specified in Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2, CR-3, CR-4, CR-5, and CR-6 below. Specifically, asphalt and pavement should be removed in and around locations where bent construction or other construction will take place, to allow for

archaeological testing by mechanical or manual excavations. This activity should take place months prior to the start of Project construction

Second, there are areas within Alternative A-1 where cultural resources identification, evaluation and mitigation, if needed, can occur only *during* construction. These areas include the active tracks and yard of Union Station north of U.S. 101, the median of U.S. 101, the active railway tracks of the BNSF yard on the west bank of the Los Angeles River, and other areas of the APE which are currently covered by modern materials, or are heavily used. Within these areas, monitoring, site identification, testing and evaluation, and subsequent mitigation through data-recovery or monitoring, would occur as specified in Mitigation Measures CR-6 and CR-5 below, and with reference to standards and procedures specified in CR-1, CR-2, CR-3, and CR-4.

In addition, all possible efforts should be made to maximize the areas within the Project APE that are evaluated and treated for buried archaeological resources *prior* to Project construction. If access can be gained prior to construction to areas such as the future platform area in front of the MTA building, construction delays could be minimized.

In certain parts of the Project APE, such as in the deep ballast in the Union Station Yard, bent construction may result in impacts to cultural resources that cannot be mitigated prior to or during construction, due to the inaccessibility of the resources beneath the ballast, and the proposed construction technique.

Cultural Resources Identification, Evaluation and Mitigation Prior to Construction

The mitigation measures detailed in CR-1 through CR-6 below would apply to undiscovered sites, as well as to the two known archaeological sites within the APE. Site CA-LAN-1575/H is essentially a buried site, covered by fill and historic-era development. Likewise, there may be unexposed elements of the ATSF site, 19-003169 that are potentially eligible for the National Register but need further study when construction is begun. Mitigation of effects to these known sites, must, therefore, be undertaken when specific impacts are identified and project construction schedules allow access.

CR-1 Stipulations in the MOA for archaeological resources would address:

- How and when archaeological resources will be identified and evaluated
- How impacts to significant resources will be minimized
- How significant resources will be treated to mitigate unavoidable impacts
- Who will participate in consultation during the Project
- How the consultation will be undertaken.

The MOA will provide general information regarding these topics; however, the *Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered During Project Implementation*, ~~Historic Properties Treatment Plan~~ to be prepared, will address each of these topics in extensive detail. A ~~an~~ *HPTP Treatment Plan* cannot be prepared prior to signing of the MOA because sufficient detail regarding construction activities and building alterations is not yet available.

CR-2 Prior to construction, FRA and the Department will prepare an archeological testing and evaluation plan that will target areas within the archaeological APE most likely to contain buried cultural resources. A Native American Burial Agreement will be prepared as part of this plan (see CR-5 below). This Burial Agreement will apply to all discoveries of Native American remains made during the Project.

In order to achieve Section 106 and CEQA compliance, a combined program of extended archival research and subsurface test excavation (if hazardous materials conditions allow) will be conducted to ensure that the Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project will identify and evaluate significant archaeological resources. This program will include site-specific archival research to aid in identifying target areas which may contain potentially important prehistoric, protohistoric, and historical archaeological resources. Archival research will result in a research design and work plan focused on the physical identification of intact subsurface archaeological remains. Prior to construction, Phase II archeological testing will be conducted in areas most likely to contain buried cultural resources.

CR-3 If resources are discovered during Phase II testing prior to construction, they will be evaluated for significance with criteria set forth in the testing plan. Initial studies will be directed toward evaluation of site significance per criteria set forth in 36 CFR 60.4 to assess the site's eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP. To achieve this goal, an archaeological testing strategy (if hazardous materials conditions permit) that carefully balances definition of data potentials and realization of those potentials would be used. These investigations will be designed to (1) define the extent, content, integrity, age, occupation units or components, and research potentials of each site, (2) define spatial, temporal and cultural relationships among sites within and near the study area; (3) advance knowledge of local and regional history and prehistory by addressing explicit research questions; (4) assess potential Project effects if a cultural property proves eligible for the NRHP; and (5) define key parameters (e.g., extent, structure, age, contents, and integrity) of each site sufficiently to define a treatment program.

CR-4 If significant archaeological deposits are found during test excavations prior to construction, a mitigation plan will be developed to ensure that important archaeological data are not lost. The mitigation plan will include methods by which prehistoric, protohistoric, and historical archaeological deposits will be avoided or recovered prior to construction. Specific provisions will also be made for the analysis of artifacts, report preparation and dissemination, and curation and disposition of artifacts consistent with the National Park Service Guidelines (36 CFR 49).

Impacts to significant finds will be mitigated through a data-recovery program using appropriate archaeological field and laboratory methods (hazardous materials conditions permitting), pursuant to the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines (48 FR 44716-44742). Since the Project will involve significant excavation, the Project timeline will accommodate a time prior to Project construction to allow for identification and evaluation of cultural resources, and for full recovery of the significant subsurface resources that would be affected by the Project.

Subsequent monitoring following Phase 3 data-recovery may be necessary during construction. As demonstrated on the other urban Los Angeles project some resources may be buried beneath historic surfaces and defy discovery until actual Project construction. Because Native

American concerns have been established, additional monitoring may be warranted. This monitoring will follow the procedures outlined in CR-6 below.

- CR-5** Prior to pre-construction testing, data-recovery and construction, a Native American Burial Agreement to recover and respectfully treat human remains will be developed in accordance with all legal requirements, and in consultation with Project agencies, the SHPO, and a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). If human remains are encountered during archaeological excavation or during construction, all excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie human remains will stop.

If human remains are exposed during construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. Construction will halt in the area of the discovery of human remains, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie human remains, the area will be protected, and consultation and treatment will occur as prescribed by law. Because of the massive nature of the proposed construction, excavation and removal of burials, in consultation with the MLD and SHPO, will be the only feasible treatment.

Cultural Resources Identification, Evaluation and Mitigation During Construction

- CR-6** Because additional unrecorded and unanticipated archaeological deposits, and possibly Native American or other human remains, could be encountered during construction, monitoring of construction will occur, unless the presence of hazardous materials precludes monitoring. Concurrent Native American monitoring will also take place, as requested by interested Native American parties. Prior to construction, a *Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered During Project Implementation* will be prepared as an addendum to the MOA, outlining the process by which the FRA and the Department will resolve any adverse effects upon newly discovered historic properties during the implementation of the Union Station Run-Through Project pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13(a)(2). The treatment plan ~~will details where monitoring will take place,~~ monitoring procedures and procedures to be followed if cultural resources are discovered.

Types of resources likely to be found, the prehistoric and historical archaeological research domains relevant to site significance, research questions, and data requirements will be detailed. The treatment options for each historic property class and detailed procedures for implementing treatment will be spelled out. Procedures for curation of materials recovered during site treatment and report requirements will be addressed. Finally, a Native American Burial Agreement will be prepared as part of this treatment plan (see CR-5).

b. Union Station Platforms, Canopies, Ramps and South Retaining Wall

This mitigation SHPO design review, comment, and design revision is consistent with the comment in the 1980 National Register nomination of Union Station that the passenger platforms and canopies have “no aesthetic value” and were mainly included so “that any new development that takes place in

their vicinity needs to be carefully designed so as to blend in with the significant portion of the station, both aesthetically and functionally.”

In a meeting with the SHPO on December 12, 2002, SHPO recommended that the design of the bridge over U.S. 101 be compatible yet differentiated from the design and materials of the re-constructed South Retaining Wall, and employ a simple, clean geometry, rather than replicate the appearance of the wall. As noted earlier, the SHPO stated that “The proposed project alternatives will not significantly alter or change those characteristics that qualify [this property] for inclusion in the [National Register] NRHP. In addition, numerous alterations that have occurred at Union Station as a result of the El Monte Busway Extension project in 1987 and the Metro Rail [Red] Line project in 1991 have introduced elements that have slightly altered the property’s historic design, materials, and setting associated with its 1939 appearance. It is these modified elements that the proposed project is designed to have the greatest impact on.” Among these modified elements in the South Retaining Wall.

To ensure that the design of the proposed project meets the recommendations for the bridge and design for other project elements do not adversely affect characteristics that qualify the LAUS for inclusion in the National Register, consultation with the SHPO will be undertaken to minimize harm to the resource, specifically regarding the treatment of the following features and spaces:

- The north portion of Platform No. 3 and the north portion of its northern ramp
- The butterfly canopies that would need to be replaced instead of re-installed, after they are disassembled and construction is completed
- The northern ramps at Platform Nos. 7 and 8
- The design of the south ends of Platform Nos. 2 and 3, which would change from straight to curved
- The Service Road design
- The break in the balustrade and the further alteration of the South Retaining Wall
- The visual change of Platform Nos. 2 and 3
- The visual change caused by the Run-Through Tracks bridge over U.S. 101 which would be located south of the South Retaining Wall.

c. Paleontological Resource Mitigation

The following mitigation measures will be implemented to mitigate potential paleontological resource impacts:

- P-1** A qualified paleontologist will monitor pile excavation spoils and surface excavations when excavations reach into older deposits (Pleistocene older alluvium or the Fernando Formation) that are likely to yield paleontological resources. This monitoring will commence with the drilling of test holes to determine the geologic conditions in areas where piles will eventually be driven or where deep excavations will eventually occur. The depths of sensitive deposits and/or areas of concern in the project area will be identified along with the pile locations prior to development of construction specifications. Construction specifications will include all necessary procedures for ensuring proper reconnaissance, work stoppage, identification and

treatment. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units are determined upon exposure and examination by a qualified paleontologist to have a low potential to contain fossil resources.

- P-2** Paleontologic monitors shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are brought to the surface. Monitors shall be empowered to temporarily halt construction or divert equipment to facilitate removal of larger specimens, if applicable.
- P-3** Recovered intact specimens shall be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates.
- P-4** Intact specimens shall be identified and curated into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage.
- P-5** A finding report will be prepared with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. The report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

3-5.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

- a. Physical destruction of an archaeological resource which is eligible for the National Register would result in an adverse effect under Section 106 regulations. However, this adverse effect can be mitigated and minimized through the mechanism of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which specifies implementation of the mitigation measures specified above.

After mitigation, the effect would be adverse (NEPA) and significant (CEQA), but would be minimized through the stipulations in the MOA.

- b. The impact on Union Station would be no adverse effect under Section 106 and a less than significant effect under CEQA. In addition, design review by SHPO through stipulations in the MOA would ensure that any potential effect remains not adverse under Section 106 and less than significant under CEQA.
- c. Impacts to paleontological resources would remain potentially significant after mitigation in the event such resources are present and they are damaged or destroyed by the pile excavation process.

3-5.5 Cumulative Impacts

3-5.5.1 Cumulative Impacts to Historic Resources

Union Station is the only non-archaeological resource that would be affected by the LAUS Run-Through Tracks project. Therefore, for the purposes of this EIS/EIR, the discussion of cumulative impacts is limited to the Union Station National Register-listed property.

Projects with cumulative or potentially cumulative effects to Union Station with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project are separated into two categories, Contextual Impacts and Operational Impacts.

3-5.5.2 Projects with Contextual Impacts to Union Station

Contextual Impacts are those affecting the overall historic character of Union station and either directly or indirectly affecting the character defining features that qualify the property for listing in the National Register. Past projects which caused adverse contextual impacts include Gateway Plaza and MTA Tower, MWD Headquarters, and El Monte Busway which are discussed in detail in section 5-5.2.5(b) above.

a. Alameda Specific Plan

The 12-story MWD Building was the first building constructed of six low to high rise buildings proposed as part of the Alameda Specific Plan. The Alameda Specific Plan, if further implemented, would include the phased construction of 2 low-rise and 3 mid- to high-rise (5 to 25 stories) buildings on the Union Station property, consisting of over 6 million square feet of new office and retail space. In addition, the plan calls for partial decking over the platform and track area to accommodate new construction directly above. These new buildings would cause direct impacts due to partial demolition and alteration of portions of the terminal buildings, visual impacts due to shadow and shade on and blocked or partially obscured views of the Union Station terminal buildings, patios and landscaping.

b. Alameda Street widening and HOV lanes and bridges over U.S. 101

This project, if implemented, would result in a reduction in the size of the National Register property along the Alameda Street frontage.

c. High-Speed Rail Project

The High-Speed Rail project has the potential to introduce adverse visual impacts at the Union Station property because its railroad tracks, passenger platforms, passenger stairs and/or elevators would be on a structure elevated above the existing Union Station platforms and canopies. Because of its height above the existing platforms and proposed Run-Through Tracks Project platforms, the structure may be highly visible in views facing east toward Union Station, and this may have adverse visual impacts on the National Register-listed property.

d. MAGLEV Project

The MAGLEV Rail Project would introduce an elevated structure similar to the proposed High-Speed Rail Project above the existing Union Station platforms and canopies. Adverse visual impacts on the National Register-listed property would be similar to those that would be caused by High-Speed Rail.

e. LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project

The LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would not cause contextual impacts, because it would continue railroad operations and would have no demonstrable visual effect on the main Union Station terminal buildings, patios and landscaping.

f. Summary of Contextual Impacts

The above-mentioned projects combined with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would have adverse contextual cumulative impacts to Union Station. However, the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would represent a minimal contribution to those impacts.

3-5.5.3 Projects with Operational Impacts to Union Station

Operational Impacts are those impacts that affect the historic day-to-day operations of Union Station as a passenger rail station, including train switching, rail passenger service and pedestrian access to and from passenger platforms. Past projects that caused adverse operational impacts include the Red Line and Gold Lines, which are discussed in detail in section 5-5.2.5(b) above.

Of the related projects identified for this EIS/EIR, the following have the potential to create operational cumulative impacts to Union Station.

a. MTA East Side Extension project

The MTA East Side LRT project will add an elevated platform and a bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101, which would cause visual impacts at the platform and track area, but would continue railroad operations. Therefore, there would be a minimal operational cumulative impact.

b. High-Speed Rail Project

The introduction of high-speed rail service at Union Station would add an elevated platform above the existing platforms and canopies and a guideway over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. It would also introduce new means for passengers to circulate, including stairs and elevators above the existing platform level. This would result in visual impacts at the platform and track area, but would continue railroad operations, albeit with a new technology. Therefore, there would be a minimal operational cumulative impact.

c. MAGLEV Rail Project

The MAGLEV Project would introduce an elevated structure similar to the proposed High-Speed Rail Project above the existing Union Station platforms and canopies, and for the same reasons, would have a minimal operational cumulative impact, despite the new railroad technology.

d. LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project

The LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would add two elevated platforms and a new bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101, which would cause visual impacts at the platform and track area, but would continue railroad operations. MTA's Pasadena Gold Line project has already introduced visual and aesthetic/architectural changes to the platform and track area at Union Station. In addition the platforms, ramps and canopies have undergone many changes and alterations due to projects that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s. Therefore, there would be a minimal cumulative impact.

e. Summary of Operational Impacts

The above-mentioned projects combined with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would represent an overall beneficial impact to Union Station because they are restoring/expanding/ enhancing passenger rail service at Union Station. These projects, combined with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project, would have adverse cumulative impacts to Union Station. However, the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would represent a minimal contribution to those impacts.

3-5.5.4 Cumulative Impacts to Archaeological Resources

Related projects in the project area and other development in the City could result in the progressive loss of as-yet-unrecorded archaeological resources. This loss, without proper mitigation, would be a significant cumulative impact. As discussed above, the archaeological survey conducted for the proposed project identified several archaeological resource sites located in the APE. Thus, the proposed project and related development in the area and region could contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on archaeological resources. However, the proposed project includes mitigation that would reduce potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than adverse and significant level. Related projects that are likely to affect archaeological resources (i.e., High-Speed Rail, MAGLEV, and other related projects in the immediate vicinity) are likely to implement similar mitigation in addition to data recovery excavations, monitoring, soils testing, photography, mapping, or drawing to adequately recover the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological resource. Consequently, after mitigation, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to an adverse or significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources.

3-5.5.5 Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources

The project area is situated upon sediments mapped as Recent alluvium, which has a low potential to contain unique paleontologic resources. However, these recent sediments overlie older Pleistocene alluvial sediments and marine that have a high potential to contain significant nonrenewable paleontologic resources and is therefore assigned high paleontologic sensitivity. Accordingly, the geographic scope of the area for potential cumulative paleontological impacts would consist of other areas in the region that are geologically similar to the project site and contain similar fossil resources.

Although many of the related projects and ongoing urban development would be located in areas that have been previously disturbed due to past development, construction activities associated with some related projects could, nonetheless, contribute to the progressive loss of paleontological resources and result in potentially significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project could disturb or destroy paleontological resources that may exist on the site, a potentially significant impact. This potential impact would remain after mitigation. Thus, the combined effects of the proposed and related projects could result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to paleontological resources.

3-4 COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

3-4.1 Existing Conditions


An inventory of community services and facilities located within the study area is shown in Table 3-4.1, and a map of those services and facilities is shown on Figure 3-4.1. The table identifies each public facility by type, name, address, distance from the proposed Alternatives, and which segment of the proposed project could affect the facility. The segments are defined in Section 2-2.3.1.

| Table 3-4.1: Inventory of Community Services and Facilities | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Map # | Facility Type | Name | Address | Approximate Distance | Affected Segment |
| 1 | Police | Little Tokyo Police Substation | 307 E. 1 st St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 2 | | Chinatown Police Substation | 823 N. Hill St. | 0.4 mile | 1 |
| 3 | | Central Community Police Station | 251 E. 6 th St | 1 mile | 3 |
| 4 | | Parker Center | 150 N. Los Angeles St. | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 5 | | Scientific Investigation Division | 555 Ramirez St., Space 270 | 0.1 mile | 1 |
| 6 | Fire | Fire Station No. 2 | 1962 E Cesar Chavez Ave | 1 mile | 3 |
| 7 | | Fire Station No. 3 | 108 N Fremont Ave | 1.1 mile | 3 |
| 8 | | Fire Station No. 4 | 800 N Main St | 0.2 mile | 1 |
| 9 | | Fire Station No. 9 | 430 E 7th St | 1.1 mile | 3 |
| 10 | | Los Angeles Fire Department Headquarters | 200 N Main St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 11 | Schools | Castelar Street Elementary School | 840 Yale St | 0.5 mile | 1 |
| 12 | | Ann Street Elementary School | 126 E. Bloom St | 0.2 mile | 1 |
| 13 | | Utah Street Elementary | 255 N Clarence St | 0.3 mile | 3 |
| 14 | | LAUSD Facilities, Maintenance, & Operations for District H | 611 Jackson St | 0.2 mile | 2, 3 |
| 15 | Parks | Pecan Park | 120 Gless Street | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 16 | | Alpine Park | 817 Yale Street | 0.5 mile | 1 |
| 17 | | City Hall Park Center | 200 N Main St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 18 | | El Pueblo De Los Angeles Historic Monument | 622 N Main St | 0.3 mile | 1, 2 |
| 19 | Places of Worship | Our Lady Queen of the Angels Old Plaza | 535 N Main St | 0.2 mile | 1, 2 |
| 20 | | Japanese Evangelical Missionary Society | 948 E 2nd St | 0.2 mile | 3 |
| 21 | | LA Plaza United Methodist Church | 115 Paseo De La Plaza | 0.2 mile | 1, 2 |
| 22 | | Maryknoll Japanese Catholic Center | 222 S Hewitt St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 23 | | Higashi Honganji Buddhist Temple | 505 E 3 rd St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 24 | | Koyasan Buddhist Temple | 342 E 1 st St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 25 | | Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist Temple | 815 E 1 st St | 0.2 mile | 3 |

Table 3-4.1: Inventory of Community Services and Facilities

| Map # | Facility Type | Name | Address | Approximate Distance | Affected Segment |
|-------|---------------------------|--|--|----------------------|------------------|
| 26 | | Zenshuji Soto Mission | 123 S Hewitt St | 0.2 mile | 3 |
| 27 | | Centenary United Methodist Church | 300 S Central Ave | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 28 | | Weller Street Baptist Church | 129 South Gless St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 29 | | World Buddhism Association of America | 837 N Spring | 0.2 mile | 1 |
| 30 | Transportation Facilities | Union Station | 800 N. Alameda St | Adjacent | 1, 2, 3 |
| 31 | Government Facilities | William Mead Homes | 1300 Cardinal St | 0.2 mile | 1 |
| 32 | | Civic Center | 1 st St, Figueroa St, 101-freeway, and San Pedro St | 0.3 mile | 2, 3 |
| 33 | | LADWP Central District Headquarters | Garey St and Ducommun St | 0.2 mile | 3 |
| 34 | | Metropolitan Water District Headquarters | 700 N Alameda | 0.1 mile | 1, 2 |
| 35 | | Metropolitan Transportation Authority Headquarters | One Gateway Plaza | 0.1 mile | 1, 2 |
| 36 | | Men's Central Jail | 441 Bauchet St | 0.1 mile | 1 |
| 37 | | Twin Towers Correction Facility | 450 Bauchet St | 0.1 mile | 1 |
| 38 | | Los Angeles Metropolitan Federal Correctional Facility | 535 N Alameda St | 0.2 mile | 2, 3 |
| 39 | Libraries | China Town Library | 639 N. Hill Street | 0.5 mile | 1 |
| 40 | | Little Tokyo Branch Library | 244 S Alameda St | 0.5 mile | 3 |
| 41 | Museums | Avila Adobe | Olvera St | 0.3 mile | 1, 2 |
| 42 | | Japanese American National Museum | 369 E 1 st St | 0.4 mile | 3 |
| 43 | | MOCA at the Geffen Contemporary | 152 N Central Ave | 0.4 mile | 3 |
| 44 | Hospitals | Pacific Alliance Medical Center | 531 West College St | 0.5 mile | 1 |
| 45 | | Los Angeles County USC Medical Center | 1200 North State St | 1.2 mile | 1, 2 |
| 46 | | White Memorial Medical Center | 1720 Cesar E. Chavez Ave | 0.7 mile | 2, 3 |

Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.



Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003

Figure 3-4.1: Community Facilities and Services

a. Police Protection

Police protection in the proposed project vicinity is provided by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Central Community Police Station, located at 251 East 6th Street in Los Angeles (see Figure 3-4.1). The Central Area encompasses approximately 4.5 square miles and includes the downtown communities of Chinatown, Little Tokyo, South Park, Central City East, the Artists Lofts, Olvera Street, the Historic Core, the Financial District, the Jewelry District, the Convention Center, and the Fashion District. According to the LAPD 2001 Statistical Digest, the Central Community Police Station is staffed by 315 sworn officers, who serve 42,516 residents. The Central District is part of the dense urban core, and land uses consist mainly of commercial and industrial; therefore, the resident population is low and daytime worker population is high compared to other police districts. In 2001, 8,292 offenses were recorded in the Central District, which is higher than the average 6,647 offenses per district citywide. The LAPD Central Police District currently responds to 26 offenses per officer per year within the district; the average number of offenses per officer citywide is 21 per year.

The proposed project vicinity for Segments 1 through 3 also includes two community substations: the Chinatown Police Substation, located at 823 N. Hill Street, and the Little Tokyo Police Substation, located at 307 E. 1st Street. Segments 1 through 3 of the proposed project are located within Basic Car Area 1A1.

Police protection for the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Red Line is provided by the LAPD Transit Group. The Transit Group works in partnership with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and MTA to enhance public safety and reduce crime on transit systems within the City and County of Los Angeles. The Transit Rail Division of the Transit Group is directly responsible for fielding and supporting police services to MTA's Red Line. Sixty-five officers are in the Rail Transit Division, and approximately 18 to 20 officers are on duty throughout the system during operating hours. Officers are trained to respond to suicides, train collisions, evacuations, searches, bomb threats, and smoke or fires (in partnership with the Los Angeles Fire Department).

Police protection for Metrolink trains is provided by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) Metrolink Bureau. The bureau's duties include policing of railroad right-of-way within Los Angeles County and on-board security for the entire system. The Metrolink Bureau is headquartered at 700 South Flower Street in Los Angeles. The Bureau's staffing includes 24 patrol deputies, 2 detectives, 3 field sergeants, 1 administrative sergeant, 3 support staff, and a lieutenant who manages the project. Sheriffs are on duty during Metrolink hours of operation, with detective support 10 hours per day Monday through Friday.

Police protection for Amtrak trains and portions of Union Station owned by Amtrak is provided by the Amtrak private police force. Amtrak officers also respond to calls on Metrolink trains when County sheriffs are not in the immediate vicinity. Amtrak officers have dual state and federal police authority. The Los Angeles-based force consists of four officers, with at least one officer on duty at all times. Amtrak is in the process of hiring two additional officers. Amtrak police are headquartered at 8th Street and Santa Fe Avenue in Los Angeles.

Parker Center, the LAPD Headquarters, is located within a half mile of the proposed Segment 3 alignments. The 272,000-square-foot building houses LAPD centralized support operations

including administration, crime prevention, records, and investigation. Parker Center is adjacent to the LAPD Metropolitan Communications Dispatch Center, one of two emergency dispatch centers in Los Angeles. Typically, emergency calls are split between the two centers. In the event of disabling circumstances at either center, all calls will be transferred to the non-disabled center.

Plans are currently under way to demolish Parker Center and to build a new police headquarters building that may include a fire station, a jail, and a bomb squad facility. The new police headquarters building would be 300,000 to 500,000 square feet and house 1,200 to 1,700 employees. The proposed location for the building is on the northeast corner of Alameda Street and 1st Street, within approximately 0.2 mile of the proposed Alternatives A and A-1. The headquarters project is expected to be completed by 2010.

The LAPD Scientific Investigation Division (SID) is also located within approximately 0.1 mile of the proposed Alternatives at 555 Ramirez Street (see Figure 3-4.1). With over 250 staff members, the SID is responsible for the collection, comparison, and interpretation of physical evidence found at crime scenes or collected from suspects and victims.

b. Fire Protection

Fire protection services for Union Station are provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) in accordance with the Los Angeles Fire Code, the Los Angeles Municipal Code, and the City of Los Angeles General Plan (see Table 3-4.2). The City of Los Angeles Fire Code, Municipal Code, and General Plan serve to guide the City departments, other government agencies, private developers, and the public in reference to the construction, maintenance, and operation of fire protection facilities in the City. In addition, standards for the distribution, design, construction, and location of fire protection facilities are established. These standards specify fire-flow criteria, minimum distances to fire stations, hydrant specifications, and access provisions for fire fighting vehicles and personnel.

Table 3-4.2: Inventory of Fire Stations Operating in the Vicinity of Union Station

| Fire Station | Location | Distance | Equipment |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|---|
| Fire Station No. 2 | 1962 E Cesar Chavez Ave | 1 mile | 12 Firefighters 1 Task Force 1 Paramedic Rescue Ambulance 1 EMT Rescue Ambulance |
| Fire Station No. 3 | 108 N Fremont Ave | 1.1 mile | 14 Firefighters 1 Task Force 1 Paramedic Rescue Ambulance. |
| Fire Station No. 4 | 800 N Main St | 0.2 mile | 15 Firefighters 1 Task Force 1 Hazmat Squad 1 Paramedic Rescue Ambulance |
| Fire Station No. 9 | 430 E 7th St | 1.1 mile | 12 Firefighters 1 Task Force 1 Paramedic Rescue Ambulance |

Note: A Task Force includes one Ladder Truck and two Engines

Source: Los Angeles Fire Department Inspector Ben Flores, 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Union Station is located within the service area of Fire Battalion 1, Division 1, which includes five fire stations. Of the Battalion's five stations, the following four stations operate in the vicinity of Union Station and the proposed project area (see Table and Figure 3-4.1): Fire Station Number 2, Fire Station Number 3, Fire Station Number 4, and Fire Station Number 9. Table 3-4.2 identifies the location and equipment of the five stations operating in the vicinity of Union Station.

In 1998, the City of Los Angeles completed a Public Safety Facilities Master plan study. This study determined that most fire stations throughout the city were too small to adequately house the necessary equipment and personnel for efficient deployment of resources. Fire Station Number 4, built in 1948, was determined to be overcrowded and its main systems antiquated. Because most incidents to which Station Number 4 responds are located south of Temple Street, the new station location would be near the proposed police headquarters at 1st Street and Alameda Street, which would reduce typical response times by approximately one-and-a-half minutes. Construction of a replacement 15,250-square-foot Fire/Paramedic Station is planned to be completed by June 2007. The new station would be large enough to house larger modern fire fighting equipment and a Paramedic Rescue Ambulance or EMT Rescue Ambulance.¹

The LAFD Headquarters is located 0.5 mile from the proposed Alternatives, and houses centralized administrative and support operations.

c. Schools

The Los Angeles Unified School District

Public schools in the proposed project area are operated by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), one of the largest public school districts in the nation. LAUSD serves the City of Los Angeles, all or portions of 16 other cities in the County, and numerous unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. LAUSD covers an area greater than 700 square miles, with an estimated population of over 4.6 million. Approximately two-thirds of the district's land area, and 82 percent of the population residing in it, falls within the City of Los Angeles.

The LAUSD provides kindergarten through high school (K-12) education as well as adult and special education programs to approximately 907,000 students in 947 schools and centers. It employs about 78,085 personnel, about half (36,721) of whom are teachers. The LAUSD's fiscal year 2001-2002 operating budget was \$9.787 billion.

As of October 2001, LAUSD's total K-12 enrollment was an estimated 736,675 students. Approximately 50 percent of these students attended the elementary school (K-6) level, 42 percent attended the middle/junior and high school levels, and 8 percent attended magnet schools and centers or other facilities throughout the District.

As shown in Table 3-4.3, enrollment, both in total and by school type, has remained generally stable over the 2000-2001 to 2001-2002 academic year, growing by a total of 1.9 percent.

¹ City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, Proposition F – Fire Facilities Bond Projects, 2003. Website: http://eng.lacity.org/projects/fire_bond/index.htm.

Table 3-4.3: LAUSD K-12 Enrollment, FY 2000-2001 and FY 2001-2002

| Grade Level | 2000-2001 | 2001-2002 |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Senior High School | 152,060 | 157,499 |
| Junior High School | 144,519 | 151,055 |
| Elementary School | 367,265 | 366,755 |
| Magnet Schools, Centers and Other Facilities | 58,883 | 61,416 |
| Total (K-12) Enrollment | 722,727 | 736,675 |

Source: LAUSD Fingertip Facts, 2001-2002.

Schools in the Proposed Project Vicinity

The proposed project is located in LAUSD District H and F. District H has a total student enrollment of 70,627 and includes communities in East Los Angeles and parts of South Central Los Angeles. Utah Street Elementary School is the only public school in District H that is located within one-half mile of the proposed project (see Table and Figure 3-4.1). During the 2001-2002 academic year, 609 students were enrolled at Utah Street School. The proposed project is also located within 0.2 mile of the LAUSD Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations building for District H. The building houses staff and supplies needed to maintain the schools in District H, including painting, plumbing, electrical, and janitorial departments. Approximately 80 LAUSD staff members work at the facility.

District F has a total student enrollment of 57,512, and includes the northeastern portion of the City of Los Angeles. Two District F schools are located within one-half mile of the proposed Alternatives. During the 2001-2002 academic year, 255 students were enrolled at Ann Street Elementary School, and 852 students were enrolled at Castelar Street Elementary School. All three schools are located in urban environments surrounded by dense residential, commercial, manufacturing, and light industrial land uses.

d. Parks

The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks maintains four parks within approximately 0.5 mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments. City Hall Park Center is located at 200 North Main Street in Los Angeles. El Pueblo De Los Angeles Historic Monument is located at 622 North Main Street in Los Angeles. Pecan Park is located at 120 Gless Street. Alpine Park is located at 817 Yale Street (see Figure 3-4.1).

e. Places of Worship

Eleven places of worship, listed in Table 3-4.1, are located within approximately 0.5 mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments. Our Lady Queen of the Angels Old Plaza, Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist Temple, Zenshuji Soto Mission, Japanese Evangelical Missionary Society, World Buddhism Association of America and LA Plaza United Methodist Church are located within a quarter mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments. Worship practices at the Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist Temple include meditation and chanting the Nenbutsu invocation. Worship practices at the Zenshuji Soto Mission include meditation and quiet contemplation. Services at all four churches typically take place on weekends and evenings.

f. Transportation Facilities

Union Station is the hub of passenger and freight rail transportation in Southern California. Union Station serves as the busiest Amtrak terminal in California and is the hub of the Southern California Metrolink commuter rail system, of local and Amtrak bus services, and of the Metro Rail subway and light rail system. Union Station serves approximately 126 Metrolink trains, 25 Amtrak *Pacific Surfliners*, and 8 Amtrak long-haul trains a day.

Passengers arriving at Union Station from Amtrak and Metrolink trains exit the station in one of three ways. First, passengers can walk across the south end of the platforms to another train on another platform. Second, they can walk down the stairs/ramps to the main passenger tunnel that runs perpendicular to the platforms above. In the tunnel they can walk east toward the MTA, Gateway Center (an office building, a bus terminal and park-and-ride facility), or the Red Line subway terminal. Passengers in the main passenger tunnel can also walk west toward Union Station where they can connect with another entrance to the Red Line subway terminal. Seventy percent of passengers arriving on Metrolink or Amtrak trains at Union Station board the Red Line.

g. Government Facilities

William Mead Homes is located 0.2 mile from the Union Station proposed project area, and adjacent to the “throat” approach to LAUS. William Mead Homes is a 449-unit public housing facility that is home to more than 1,400 low-income residents. The 24 buildings were built in 1942, and hazardous material remediation is currently taking place on the site. The buildings are surrounded by industrial, manufacturing, and commercial land uses.

The Los Angeles Civic Center, located 0.3 mile west of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments, contains the largest concentration of government employees in the United States outside of Washington, D.C. The Civic Center includes the Los Angeles County Courthouse, Los Angeles County Criminal Courts Building, Department of Water and Power office building, Los Angeles City Hall, LAPD’s Parker Center, Federal Courthouse, Roybal Federal Building, and the Ronald Reagan State Office Building.

Three major municipal buildings are located within 0.2 mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Table and Figure 3-4.1). The City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) Central District Headquarters building is the center for all fleet operations for the metropolitan area of the LADWP, the construction and maintenance center for water service to the central portion of the City, the primary material and storage center for the water system, and center for several customer services including meter reading, field services, and field investigations. Approximately 700 people report to and operate out of the yard, which contains underground fuel storage systems, a recently built compressed natural gas facility for fueling city vehicles, underground power, fiber optics, security systems, and communications. The site operates 24 hours a day and requires continual accessibility that is essential to continued water and power supply in on-going and emergency situations. The facility is located 0.2 mile west of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments. The Metropolitan Water District Headquarters, located 0.1 mile west of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments, provides 980,000 square feet of office space and parking. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Headquarters, located 0.1 mile east of the proposed alignments, provides 2,300,000 square feet of parking, office space, and an intermodal transit facility.

The Men's Central Jail and the Twin Towers Correctional Facility, both located 0.1 mile east of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Figure 3-4.1), are operated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Men's Central Jail is a 935,000-square-foot correctional facility with a working capacity of 7,198 prisoners, and an average daily inmate population during January 2003 of 6,892. The Twin Towers Correctional Facility is the world's largest known jail facility, containing 1.2 million square feet. Over 2,400 sworn and civilian personnel are employed at the facility. The working capacity of Twin Towers is 5,199, with an average daily inmate population during January 2003 of 5,014. The Medical Services Building is used for the hospitalization of inmates for the entire Los Angeles County jail system (approximately 19,000 to 20,000 inmates systemwide). Treatments range from drug treatment to AIDS treatment. The total working capacity of the Medical Services Building is 200 to 213, and the average inmate population during January 2003 was 182.

Los Angeles Metropolitan Detention Center is located 0.2 miles southwest of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Figure 3-4.1). The facility is operated by the U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons. As of October 17, 2002, 1,041 male and female prisoners were detained at the facility. The rated capacity of the detention facility is 728 inmates.

h. Libraries and Museums

The Little Tokyo Branch Library is located approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Table and Figure 3-4.1). A new Little Tokyo Branch Library is under construction at the corner of Los Angeles Street and Second Street. The new library is scheduled for completion in 2005, at which time the existing library would close. The Chinatown Branch Library is a new library that opened in 2003 at 39 N. Hill Street, located approximately 0.5 mile northwest of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments.

Three museums are located within one-half-mile of the proposed alignments (see Table and Figure 3-4.1). Avila Adobe is the oldest residence in Los Angeles; it was constructed about 1818 for the city's mayor, and now houses a museum representing the lifestyle of Los Angeles in the 1840s. The Japanese American National Museum is the only museum in the United States dedicated to the history of Americans of Japanese ancestry. The museum is approximately 138,000 square feet. The Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA) at the Geffen is located next to the Japanese American National Museum. The contemporary art museum opened in an old police warehouse in 1983. It was intended to be a temporary location, but became so popular MOCA decided keep it open.

i. Hospitals

The Pacific Alliance Medical Center (PAMC), the second oldest hospital in the City of Los Angeles, is located approximately 0.5 mile northwest of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Table and Figure 3-4.1). PAMC's services include general medical, surgical and intensive care, 24-hour urgent care, maternity and gynecology, outpatient surgery, and acute rehabilitation.

Los Angeles County USC Medical, one of the largest acute care hospitals in America, is located approximately 1.2 miles east of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Table and Figure 3-4.1). Licensed for 1,395 beds and budgeted to staff 745 beds, the hospital provides emergency, inpatient, outpatient, surgical, obstetrical, and gynecological, pediatric, and burn care services. Approximately 28 percent of trauma cases in the community are directed to County USC Medical Center. Nearly 250,000 people are treated annually in the emergency room. The hospital is scheduled for replacement by 2007. The new facility would be located next to the existing facility and would include 1.5 million square feet with 600 beds.

White Memorial Medical Center, located approximately 0.7 mile east of the proposed alignments (see Table and Figure 3-4.1), is a full-service, not-for-profit 350-bed hospital. The hospital provides women's services, children's, emergency, rehabilitation, cancer, cardiac, outpatient, and community outreach services.

3-4.2 Environmental Impacts

3-4.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

An inventory of police stations, fire stations, and hospitals within one-and-a-quarter-miles of the proposed alignments, and schools, parks, places of worship, transportation facilities, libraries, museums, and government facilities within one-half mile of the proposed alignments, was compiled. Each public service was then evaluated to determine how it would be affected by the proposed project.

3-4.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. Police and Fire Protection

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if it:

- creates a substantial need for additional police or fire services requiring new or altered police or fire facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times, the construction of which would cause a substantial adverse physical change in the environment
- substantially diminishes the level of police or fire protection services, thereby posing a significant hazard to public safety and security
- creates the potential risks of upset or emergencies (e.g., train collision or derailment).

b. Schools

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if either:

- the students generated by the project were to exceed existing enrollment capacities, thereby creating a substantial need for new or altered facilities, the construction of which would cause a substantial adverse physical change in the environment, or
- the physical effects of the project were to substantially affect the health, safety, or education of students at local schools.

c. Recreation Facilities and Parks

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if it would result in any of the following:

- create a substantial need for additional recreation facilities and/or parks to keep current facilities from becoming overburdened, the construction of which would cause a substantial adverse physical change in the environment
- increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated
- occupy a publicly owned park or recreation facility
- create proximity impacts to a park or recreation facility so great that the purposes for which the park or recreation facility exists are substantially impaired.

d. Transportation and Government Facilities

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if it would result in either of the following:

- create a substantial need for additional transportation or government facilities to keep current facilities from becoming overburdened, the construction of which would cause a substantial adverse physical change in the environment, or
- create the physical effects that substantially affect the health or safety of patrons or employees of these facilities.

e. Places of Worship

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if:

- the physical effects of the project substantially affect patrons' access to the facility, or disrupt the basic functions of the facility.

f. Libraries and Museums

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if either:

- the physical effects of the project substantially affect patron’s access to the facility or disrupt the basic functions of the facility, or
- physical effects of the project substantially affect the health or safety of patrons or employees.

g. Hospitals

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) environmental impact if either:

- physical effects of the project substantially affect access to the facility, or
- physical effects of the project substantially affect the health or safety of patients or employees.

3-4.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would not involve construction of the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project; therefore, no construction-period impacts would occur. Other transportation projects in the area may cause construction-period impacts. These potential impacts are addressed in the environmental documents for those projects.

b. Alternative A

Police Protection

Potential impacts to police protection services from the proposed Alternative A would be related to the effects of traffic and access disruptions on emergency response time. Increased traffic congestion caused by construction vehicles and access disruptions, such as road closures or road construction, could affect emergency response times; however, these disruptions are expected to be temporary and intermittent and would not result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts. A traffic management plan (TMP) would be developed for the construction period. The TMP would include provisions for coordinating with LAPD, LASD, and Amtrak police to develop alternative routes, or to amend service areas as necessary to maintain emergency service coverage and response times during project construction.

Fire Protection

According to the LAFD, the adequacy of fire protection for a given area is based on required fire-flow levels, initial response distances from existing fire stations, and the LAFD's judgment for needs in the area. In general, the required fire-flow is closely related to land use. The quantity of water necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard. Fire-flow requirements vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm) in low-density residential areas to 12,000 gpm in high-density commercial or industrial areas. In the proposed project vicinity, an industrial area where hydrants are required to be no more than 300 feet apart, adequate fire-flow is not a problem. During construction, temporary water supply disruptions may occur; however, disruptions would be infrequent and would typically last less than an hour. All construction practices would comply with the local fire code.

The Fire Prevention and Protection Plan of Los Angeles sets the response distance criterion at 0.75 mile for an engine company and 1.0 mile for a truck company. Fire Station No. 4, on Main Street, is currently located approximately 0.2 mile from the proposed alignments and within the 0.75-mile criterion for an engine company. The proposed site for the new Fire Station No. 4, at 1st Street and Alameda Street, would be located within 0.2 mile of the proposed alignments, which also meets the plan criteria. A total of four fire stations are located within 1.25 miles of the proposed alignments. According to LAFD Sergeant Mike Thule, few places in the city have better fire-flow or station access. As such, fire protection services would be considered adequate.

LAFD's typical response time in the vicinity of Union Station is 6 minutes. The minimum response for a major call would include two Task Forces (20 firefighters), a Light Force or Engine Company, a Paramedic Rescue Ambulance, the Battalion Chief, and a Hazmat Team. Firefighters would respond from two to four of the surrounding fire stations. Access disruptions, such as road closures or road construction, could affect emergency response times; however, these disruptions would be temporary and intermittent and would not be adverse/significant. No long-term road closures or detours would occur during project construction; some short-term closures may be required to install bridge spans across certain roadways. The TMP would include provisions for coordinating with LAFD to develop alternative routes, or to amend service areas as necessary to maintain emergency service coverage and response times during project construction.

Schools

Three elementary schools are located within one-half mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (see Table 3-4.1 and Figure 3-4.1). Ann Street Elementary School, located approximately 0.25 mile north of LAUS, could experience elevated noise levels and reduced air quality related to construction activity during Stage 1 and part of Stage 2 of the construction process. Stage 1 and Stage 2 are expected to last for approximately six to nine months. However, all three schools are located in dense urban environments, and the incremental change in noise levels or air quality during construction would not be adverse/significant.

Utah Street School is located across the Los Angeles River from the proposed project, and no through streets connect construction sites to the school. Therefore, construction-related traffic

should not affect the safety of school children. Castelar Street Elementary School and Ann Street Elementary School are located in the northern segment of the proposed project. The majority of construction traffic would occur south of Union Station on Alameda Street. However, construction vehicles could occasionally use major roads located near the schools. This small increase in traffic would not be an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact to schoolchildren in the proposed project vicinity.

Temporary detours related to construction may decrease vehicular accessibility in the vicinity of the LAUSD Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations Building. However, these disruptions would be temporary, intermittent and are not expected to be adverse/significant.

Parks

Construction activities would result in temporary, periodic noise, vibration, air quality, and visual impacts that may indirectly affect parks and recreational facilities. However, because the park nearest to the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments (El Pueblo De Los Angeles Historic Monument) is approximately 0.3 mile away, and, because several intervening structures would buffer noise, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts are expected. No direct or indirect park use would be required for construction of the proposed alignments.

Places of Worship

Eleven places of worship lie within one-half mile of proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments; 6 of them are within a quarter-mile. Church patrons may experience detours related to construction in the proposed project vicinity. However, the majority of construction procedures would not require street closures or detours and would occur during the week. Consequently, any disruptions would be temporary, intermittent and are not expected to be adverse/significant.

The six churches within a quarter mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments could experience slightly elevated noise and vibration levels due to construction-related activities. However, most construction would take place during the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday and would not affect worship services. The places of worship located within one-quarter mile of the proposed Alternative A and A-1 alignments are primarily used on weekends and on weeknights after 5 p.m.

Transportation Facilities

Union Station is part of the proposed project. Platform demolition and construction is not expected to disrupt train schedules or substantially inconvenience patrons. Passengers may be exposed to nuisances associated with construction, such as dust or noise. However, exposure would be minimal, as most construction would take place during off-peak commute times. Passenger flow in the Main Passenger Tunnel is not expected to be disrupted during construction because new Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would be fully operational before Platform Nos. 2 and 3 are demolished. Entrances to platforms under construction would be sealed off from the Main Passenger Tunnel during construction to control dust and prevent inappropriate access. Some inconveniences and pedestrian detours may occur, but no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to Union Station patrons are expected to result from the proposed project.

Government Facilities

Residents at William Mead Homes, located approximately 0.25 mile north of Union Station, may experience occasional and sporadic elevated noise levels and reduced air quality related to construction activities during Stage 1 and part of Stage 2 of the construction process. Stage 1 and Stage 2 are expected to last for approximately 6 to 9 months. However, most construction noise and air quality impacts would be very localized and would substantially dissipate over the distance between construction sites and the housing area before residents of the William Mead homes would be exposed. In addition, the housing units are located in a dense urban environment, and the incremental change in noise levels or air quality during construction is not expected to be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

Men's Central Jail includes a medical facility; patients of the facility may be exposed to minor increases in noise and reduced air quality during project construction. However, these impacts would be less than significant because the concrete facility is well insulated from noise and contains sealed windows and a ventilation system that would help filter construction emissions.

Potential impacts to the Civic Center, LADWP Central District Headquarters, MTA Headquarters, MWD Headquarters, Men's Central Jail, and Metropolitan Detention Center from the proposed project would be related to the effects of construction traffic, detours, and access disruptions. Full access to all the facilities should be maintained during construction. Most of the construction related traffic would occur on Alameda Street south of U.S. 101. Few traffic disruptions are expected to occur near the Men's Central Jail, Twin Towers correctional facility, the Civic Center, MTA Headquarters, or MWD Headquarters. Occasional disruptions may occur near Metropolitan Detention Center and LADWP Central District Headquarters because construction activities would be more intense in that area. Any disruptions would be temporary and intermittent, and should not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA). Construction activities near these facilities would be regulated by a Traffic Management Program (see Section 3-15.3)

Libraries and Museums

Construction activities could result in temporary, periodic noise, vibration, and air quality impacts that may indirectly affect library and museum patrons. However, both libraries, the Japanese American National Museum, and MOCA at the Geffen Contemporary are all located over 0.4 mile from the proposed alignments. Therefore, patrons are not expected to be affected by construction-related activities. Avila Adobe Museum is located 0.2 mile from the proposed alignments, and patrons may be exposed to low levels of construction related noise or reduced air quality. However, impacts are not expected to be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) because of the distance and intervening structures.

Hospitals

All three hospitals in the proposed project vicinity are located more than one-half mile from the proposed alignments. Due to the distance from the alignments and the availability of alternative streets in emergency rescue situations, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts are expected for emergency vehicle access or vehicular access to the hospitals. A TMP

would be developed for the construction period, which would establish alternative routes to maintain emergency service coverage and response times during project construction. Additionally the hospitals are located far enough away from the proposed alignments that noise impacts would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

c. Alternative A-1

The construction period impacts expected under Alternative A-1 would be identical to those expected under Alternative A.

3-4.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would keep existing rail facilities in place. No large-scale construction would take place, and environmental conditions would not change. The only public facilities required would be those needed to accommodate the projected growth in the area, and would not be associated with this alternative. No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would be associated with this alternative.

b. Alternative A

Police Protection

Potential long-term impacts to police protection services from the proposed Alternative A would be related to the demand for additional services and safety.

The LAPD Central Police District is one of the busiest districts in the city. However, the proposed project is not expected to place additional demand upon city officers because LAPD responds to very few calls at Union Station or on Metrolink and Amtrak trains. Most calls are answered by Amtrak police or Los Angeles County sheriffs.

The proposed project is intended to accommodate projected expansion of Metrolink and Amtrak services and increases in train ridership. The proposed project would not cause the increase in ridership but better accommodate it. Any additional demand for police service in the proposed project area would result from planned residential and business growth and not from the proposed project; as such, growth in the study area should be accommodated through the normal police expansion process. Service levels for police protection are expected to be adequate with or without the proposed project.

MTA and Amtrak would work with all three police departments during the design process to ensure safety issues are adequately addressed. Amtrak would also be required by the FRA to develop a Local Emergency Preparedness Plan that would include the new run-through tracks. The plan would address evacuation procedures, rescue procedures, and address procedures for handling train collisions or upsets on the bridge. Additional safety and evacuation procedures are discussed in Section 3-13, Safety and Security. Because the bridge is relatively short, and because LAPD and LASD already serve several other elevated rail structures in the City of Los

Angeles, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the need for additional police officers or special equipment to respond to project-related emergencies.

Fire Protection

Potential long-term impacts to fire protection services from the proposed Alternative A would be related to the demand for additional services and safety. The proposed project is located in a portion of the city with higher than average LAFD service coverage and fire flow levels are more than adequate. The fire department is currently expanding in response to projected growth of businesses and residences in the area. The new Fire Station Number 4, which will house an additional Paramedic Rescue Ambulance and modernized equipment, will be constructed within 0.2 mile of the proposed alignments and will be completed before the proposed project construction begins. The proposed project is not expected to substantially affect the number of calls to which the LAFD responds. Therefore, service levels for fire protection are expected to be adequate with or without the proposed project.

Project engineers would continue to work with LAFD to ensure fire/life safety issues are adequately addressed. They would also coordinate development of evacuation plans for the aerial portions of the structure and response plans in case of emergencies. Additional safety and evacuation procedures are discussed in Section 3-13, Safety and Security. Because the bridge is relatively short, and because LAFD already serves several other elevated rail structures in the City of Los Angeles, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the need for additional firefighters or special equipment to respond to project-related emergencies.

Schools

The proposed alternatives are not expected to result in additional residents living in the vicinity of Union Station. Therefore, no additional students generated by the proposed project would exceed existing enrollment capacities, thus creating a substantial need for new or altered facilities.

Operation of the proposed project would not substantially increase noise levels or reduce air quality at any of the three schools in the proposed project vicinity. Given the distances to existing schools, operation of the proposed project is unlikely to create health or safety issues for students or school staff.

Parks

Recreation facilities and parks located in the vicinity of the proposed project are not expected to be overburdened or to experience an increase in use that would cause acceleration in the deterioration of these parks due to the proposed project. Pecan Park and Alpine Park are neighborhood parks located on small streets that are not readily accessible from Union Station. City Hall Park Center is not a typical park; it consists of open space utilized by City Hall patrons. El Pueblo De Los Angeles Historic Monument is a Los Angeles landmark that attracts thousands of people every year. The proposed project would not induce population growth in the project area (residential or business) that would increase use of the parks.

The proposed project is located far enough away from all four parks that no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) noise, vibration, or air quality impacts to parks and recreational facilities are anticipated. No direct or indirect park use would be required for operation of the proposed alignments.

Places of Worship

The proposed alternatives are not expected to substantially affect patrons' access to worship facilities, or disrupt the basic functions of the facilities in the proposed project vicinity. Noise from the operation of the tracks is not expected to substantially exceed existing conditions at any of the places of worship. The proposed project would not permanently close roads affecting access to places of worship. Therefore, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to places of worship are anticipated.

Transportation Facilities

The proposed project would accommodate projected transit riders and would help riders better utilize existing transportation facilities. No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to transportation facilities are anticipated under this alternative. This alternative would improve service by reducing potential delays associated with stub end operations at LAUS.

Government Facilities

The William Mead Homes and Men's Central Jail medical center are both located adjacent to existing rail lines just north of the LAUS throat. Currently, all of the trains entering or exiting Union Station travel past the facilities. The run-through tracks would increase the number of trains that are able to enter and exit Union Station by adding a southern approach to Union Station; however, the proposed project would also reduce the number of trains entering and exiting from the northern approach. Residents at the William Mead Homes and patients at the medical facility would not experience substantial increases in noise or reductions in air quality due to operation of the proposed project.

The proposed alternative is not expected to disrupt access to government facilities or cause health or safety risks to government facility patrons or employees, due to the distance of the proposed project from the facilities.

Hospitals

Because the proposed project would not result in any long-term street closures or increases in local traffic congestion, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts are expected for emergency vehicle access or vehicular access to the hospitals. All three of the medical centers in the proposed project vicinity would experience no significant noise or air quality impacts, due to intervening structures and the distance from the proposed project.

c. Alternative A-1

The expected long-term impacts under Alternative A-1 would be identical to those expected under Alternative A.

3-4.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

The study area for the public services cumulative impacts analysis consists of the service areas for the police and fire stations that serve areas surrounding Union Station. The study area also includes schools that serve the communities in the vicinity of Union Station that could experience increases in population due to proposed project construction and cumulative development.

a. Police Protection

Amtrak operates its own security service, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD) patrols Metrolink facilities. The Los Angeles Police Department provides services when needed and requested by Amtrak police or County sheriffs. Amtrak police, supported by LAPD and LACSD, would provide police protection services for the proposed project. Proposed Related Projects include construction or rehabilitation of over 4,400 residential units and over 7 million square feet of commercial, office, public, medical, and retail space. New construction would likely increase the residential and employee populations in the proposed project study area, which would place additional demand on the LAPD Central Community Police station. However, the proposed LAPD Police Headquarters, which would be located within 0.2 mile of the proposed run-through tracks project, would likely accommodate future demand in the area. Because Amtrak maintains its own security, the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project is not expected to contribute to cumulative impacts to police services or cumulative increases in demand for police services. Therefore, the proposed project would have no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on police services.

b. Fire Protection

As discussed earlier, the proposed project is not expected to increase demand for fire protection services because such demand is primarily attributable to increased commercial and residential development rather than commuter transit projects. Increases in the residential and employee populations in the area are expected as a result of the development component of related projects, and as a consequence, demand for fire protection services in the area would increase. However, because the proposed project would not by itself increase fire protection demands, it would not contribute to cumulative impacts to fire protection services or cumulative increases in demand for fire protection services. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to potentially adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts.

c. Schools

Related projects in the proposed project vicinity would include an increase of approximately 4,400 residential units, and multiple commercial/industrial/office developments. The new

residential development would directly increase enrollment in local schools. Student enrollment could also be indirectly affected by increases in employment due to new non-residential development. Residential and commercial/industrial development proposed in the area could be substantial, and schools that are currently overcrowded could be adversely affected by increased enrollment. New or expanded facilities would be required. One public high school and one charter school have been proposed in the project vicinity, which would accommodate some of the demand. Because the proposed project is a commuter transit project that would not increase the number of residential units in the project area, it would not increase local school enrollment and, therefore, would not contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts to schools.

d. Parks

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the proposed project and related projects could place additional demands on park services in the area. Construction of the proposed Cornfield State Park, a 32-acre park, and renovations at El Pueblo De Los Angeles would help to accommodate the need for parks in the downtown area. If additional park facilities were required to maintain existing service levels, significant cumulative impacts could occur. However, because the proposed project would not affect demand for parks, the proposed project would not result in or substantially contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on parks.

e. Places of Worship

The proposed project would provide an alternative transportation mode into the downtown LA area, and is expected to reduce future vehicular trips to and from the project area. This would have beneficial effects of reducing traffic-related inconveniences (such congestion, noise and air quality) to places of worship. Related projects such as development projects would increase residential and employee populations in the proposed project area, which in turn could increase demand for places of worship. The proposed project is not expected to contribute to the cumulative demand for places of worship because users of the proposed project would likely utilize such places in the vicinity of their homes. Consequently, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on places of worship.

f. Transportation Facilities

Related projects such as development projects have the potential to increase vehicular traffic in the proposed project area. The impacts of, and potential mitigation pertaining to, related projects would be addressed in the environmental document for each project. The proposed project would provide an alternative mode of transportation to and from the downtown area, with a corresponding decrease in vehicular travel. Consequently, the proposed project is expected to reduce congestion and demand for vehicle-related transportation facilities and thus is not expected to contribute to significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project would help to accommodate planned increases in transit services.

g. Government Facilities

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the proposed project and related projects would not place additional demands on government facilities in the proposed project vicinity because the demand for service at the federal and county jails, the civic center, William Mead Homes, and municipal office buildings, is not derived from the population immediately surrounding the facilities. Each of the facilities is designed to accommodate the needs of the City or County as a whole. Therefore, the proposed project and related projects are not expected to result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on government facilities.

h. Libraries and Museums

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the proposed project and related projects could place additional demands on library services in the proposed project vicinity. The China Town Branch Library and the Little Tokyo Branch library have recently been rebuilt to accommodate the additional needs of downtown residents. In addition, the Central Los Angeles Public Library, which has a collection of over two million items, is located 1.25 miles from the proposed project, in the center of downtown. If additional library facilities were required to maintain existing service levels, significant cumulative impacts could occur. However, because the proposed project would not affect demand for libraries, the proposed project would not result in or substantially contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on libraries.

Increases in residential and employee populations due to related projects could result in more downtown congestion, which could adversely affect traffic, noise levels, and air quality in the proposed project vicinity. However, the proposed project would actually result in decreases in vehicular travel to and from the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on libraries or museums.

i. Hospitals

Increases in residential and employee populations due to related projects could place additional demands on hospital services in the area. Los Angeles County USC Medical Center and White Memorial Medical Center, two hospitals in the proposed project vicinity, are currently undergoing reconstruction. The White Memorial Medical Center renovation will include an additional 105,000 square feet. The County USC Medical Center reconstruction will include a total of 1.5 million square feet. Both facilities will be better equipped to handle the medical needs of downtown residents. If additional hospital facilities were required to maintain existing service levels, significant cumulative impacts could occur. However, because the proposed project would not affect demand for hospitals, the proposed project would not result in or substantially contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on hospitals.

3-4.3 Potential Mitigation

3-4.3.1 Construction Period

a. Alternative A

Police Protection

Although no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to police protection services are anticipated, the following measure would be implemented as part of the Traffic Management Program (TMP) to minimize potential construction impacts.

PS-1 Prior to initiation of any construction activities that may interfere with emergency service and access, the construction contractor shall consult and coordinate with the Amtrak Police, LASD, and LAPD to ensure disruption is minimized and to identify alternative routes for emergency vehicles.

Fire Protection

The following measures shall be implemented as part of the TMP to ensure that potential impacts would not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA):

FPS-1 Project engineers shall consult with the City Engineer and the City of Los Angeles Fire Department to ensure adequate access for Fire Department vehicles and equipment.

FPS-2 The proposed project shall comply with all applicable codes and regulations administered by the State Architect and State Fire Marshall.

FPS-3 Prior to initiation of any construction activities that may interfere with emergency service and access, the construction contractor shall consult and coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department to ensure disruption is minimized and to identify alternative routes for emergency vehicles.

Schools

Please see Section 3-2, Air Quality, and Section 3-11, Noise, for measures to mitigate construction air quality and noise impacts. The following measures will be implemented as part of the TMP to ensure access to school facilities.

SPS-1 Contractors shall ensure that safe and convenient pedestrian routes to schools are maintained during construction.

SPS-2 Entrances to the LAUSD maintenance facility would not be blocked during construction.

b. Alternative A-1

Mitigation measures for Alternative A-1 would be identical to those for Alternative A.

3-4.3.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

Because no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) long-term impacts would occur to public facilities and services, no mitigation is required.

3-4.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-4.4.1 Construction Period

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No unavoidable adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to public facilities or services are expected as a result of Alternative A.

3-4.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No unavoidable adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to public facilities or services are expected as a result of Alternative A.

3-3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3-3.1 Existing Conditions

Information on existing biological resources is based on the following sources:

- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Rarefind2 search for Los Angeles and Hollywood United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangles. The CNDDDB is a standard source of the most recent record of occurrences of California's rarest plants, animals, and natural communities. The inventory is maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and is continually refined and updated.
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California online search of Los Angeles and Hollywood USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles for information on the distribution and habitat requirements of sensitive plant taxa.
- Reconnaissance-level site reviews for biological resources, consisting of a visual survey of all areas potentially affected by the proposed alignments.

3-3.1.1 Regulatory Framework

a. Federal

Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543) (as amended) directs all federal agencies to participate in endangered species conservation. Under the federal ESA, the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is mandated to protect and aid in the conservation of federally listed threatened or endangered species through consultation and permitting of take (displacement). Under the Section 7 consultation process, USFWS determines the effects of any federal action on listed species, renders an opinion that includes conditions and requirements for implementation of the project, and authorizes takes that may occur incidental to an otherwise legal activity.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) implemented conventions that expanded international protection for migratory birds. Treaties between the U.S., Canada, Mexico, and Japan are incorporated into the MBTA as an amendment, and the provisions of the new treaty are implemented domestically. These four treaties and their enabling legislation, the MBTA, established federal responsibilities for the protection of nearly all species of birds, their eggs, and their nests. The MBTA is one of the laws under which the USFWS functions. Under the MBTA, it is unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, or kill migratory birds. The law applies to the removal of nests (such as swallow nests on bridges) occupied by migratory birds during the breeding season. During the breeding season

(generally February to September) disruption of nesting activities and destruction or removal of nests, eggs, and birds is prohibited under the MBTA.

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. 1251-1376) provides guidance for the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters.

Section 401 requires that an applicant for a federal license or permit that allows activities resulting in a discharge to jurisdictional waters (including wetland/riparian areas) of the United States, must obtain a state water quality certification that the discharge complies with other provisions of CWA. The Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) administer the certification program in California.

Section 402 establishes a permitting system for the discharge of any pollutant (except dredge or fill material) into waters of the United States. The RWQCB also administers the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for construction activities and operations.

Section 404 establishes a permit program administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulating the discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the United States (including wetlands). The USACE has permit authority derived from Section 404 of the CWA (33 CFR Parts 320-330). The permit review process includes an assessment of potential adverse impacts to wetlands and streambed habitats and determination of any required mitigation measures. A 401 Water Quality Certification is required in conjunction with a 404 permit. Where federally listed species may be affected, a Section 7 consultation with the USFWS under the federal ESA is also required.

b. State

California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & Game Code §§ 2050, et seq.) generally parallels the main provisions of the Federal Endangered Species Act and is administered by the CDFG. State lead agencies are required to consult with CDFG to ensure that any action it undertakes is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any state listed endangered, threatened, or candidate plant and animal species. Section 2081 of CESA allows for takes that are incidental to otherwise lawful projects. Early consultation is emphasized to avoid potential impacts to sensitive species and to develop appropriate mitigation planning to offset project-caused losses of listed species populations and their essential habitats.

Streambed Alterations

Section 1600 of the CDFG Code 1600 requires that any person, state, or local government agency or public utility proposing a project that may affect a river, stream, or lake to notify the CDFG. In addition to protection of state-listed species under CESA, the agency also has surface water jurisdiction to protect wildlife values and native plant resources associated with waters of the State. If CDFG determines that the project may adversely affect existing fish and wildlife resources, a Section 1600 Lakebed or Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) may be required.

Required conditions within the SAA are intended to address potentially significant adverse impacts within CDFG jurisdictional limits.

c. Local

City of Los Angeles Street Tree Division Policy

The Street Tree Division policy, administered by the Public Works Department, Bureau of Street Services, is directed toward the preservation of all parkway trees. The policy does not provide for removal unless the tree is dead or cannot be trimmed and/or root pruned to be made safe. Removal is permitted under certain circumstances including construction of structures. It should be noted that FRA and the Department are not bound by policies of the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed project would voluntarily be implemented in accordance with the Street Tree policy to the extent feasible.

3-3.1.2 Scope and Results of Survey

A field review was conducted to document the presence and location of any native plant communities or wildlife habitat. Due to the heavily commercialized and industrialized nature of the project site, no formal biological transects or surveys were conducted. A reconnaissance-level site review was conducted by a biologist on March 9, 2003. The review consisted of a visual survey of all areas potentially affected by the proposed alignments. Open areas/lots and parkways within the project area that contained areas of exposed soils and vegetation were field checked. Accessible portions of the 1st Street Bridge structure were examined for the presence of bats and roosting habitat for bats. A reconnaissance-level site review of the proposed Mail Transfer Facility relocation site was also conducted by a biologist on June 7, 2003.

a. Union Station Segment

The Union Station Segment is a developed, built facility with formal landscaping. No native habitats, vegetation, wildlife, or sensitive species are present in the portion of Union Station proposed for modifications.

b. U.S. 101 Crossing Segment

This segment includes the El Monte Busway and U.S. Route 101 (U.S. 101), which are paved roadways with no vegetation on the shoulders or median. No native habitat, vegetation, wildlife, or sensitive species are present in this segment

c. Trestle Segment

Starting from the U.S. 101 eastbound onramp, this segment traverses approximately parallel to Commercial Street. Between Hewitt Street and Center Street, disturbed lots are located to the north and south of Commercial Street. On the north side, between Hewitt Street and Vignes Street, the lot is a paved (asphalt) parking lot with non-native trees lining the southern edge along the sidewalk. The east end of the lot that borders the eastbound on-ramp is an unpaved (dirt), wide shoulder area with trash and weeds. The vacant lot between the east side of the on-ramp and Center Street is an open dirt lot that is fenced. Trash, non-native grasses, and weeds are present.

On the south side of Commercial Street between Hewitt Street and Garey Street, the fenced, vacant lot is paved (broken asphalt) with weeds (711 Ducommun Street). The facility between Vignes Street and Center Street is also fenced. It is an open dirt lot situated below grade with weedy plant species growing around the perimeter and is the site of a former gassification plant. As the alignment heads east, it would then cross through a paved lot in the 500 block of Center Street. As the tracks head south into the Burlington North Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) yards, there is an open lot located south of Commercial Street, north of Ducommun Street, east of the MTA heavy-rail train portal and west of the BNSF yard tracks, overhead transmission line corridor, and Los Angeles River. This lot is paved and is used as a hazardous waste storage facility by the City of Los Angeles.

d. Mail Service Segment

The future site of the relocated Mail Transfer Facility is located west of the Los Angeles River, east of the eastern terminus of 16th Street, and north of Washington Boulevard. The site is adjacent to the Amtrak passenger/equipment maintenance facility (known as Redondo Junction). The proposed site for the Mail Transfer Facility is in an area that has been developed as a rail yard since the early 1900s. The area is highly industrialized with rail-related industrial uses around the existing tracks. The proposed site is adjacent to and east of the southernmost terminus of the outermost railroad spur. The site is a vacant asphalt paved lot. An asphalt-paved storage and parking lot for containers on truck trailers is located west of the site and the railroad spur; the Redondo Main Center building is located to the north; two temporary trailers and containers are located to the east; and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way is located to the south. The entire site is paved.

3-3.1.3 Environmental Setting

The following biological assessment of the project site is based on information compiled through the field review, CNDDDB and CNPS database searches, previous documentation, and appropriate reference materials.

a. Plant Communities and Habitats

Run-Through Tracks Segments 1 to 3

The project area (Segments 1 to 3) does not encompass any wetlands, riparian, sensitive habitats, wild or scenic rivers or natural landmarks. The area is a highly developed, urbanized section within the downtown city of Los Angeles. The proposed project site is primarily composed of commercial and industrial uses with scattered residential uses. Plant communities present are classified as developed and disturbed including, urban (roads, built lots), ornamental landscaping, and disturbed or barren (vacant) lots. No natural communities are present within the proposed project area that would support native and sensitive plant and wildlife species. Non-native (exotic) and weedy plant species are present in landscaped areas and vacant lots.

No open space, natural areas are present within the proposed project area. The site review did not indicate any riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities in this urbanized area. The closest open space/natural area within a one-mile radius of the project is Elysian Park, to the

north. Elysian Park is a regional park in the Santa Monica Mountains Zone of the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

No jurisdictional wetlands and “waters of the United States” are present within the proposed project area. The reach of the Los Angeles River east and adjacent to the proposed project area is a concrete-lined flood control channel that is surrounded by urban, commercial and industrial development. The river primarily receives reclaimed wastewater released upstream into the river by the Department of Water and Power near the Sepulveda Basin. Native and non-native plant species are present throughout the various reaches of the river, mostly in the sections north of the project between the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin and Frogtown, where the natural sandy bottom of the channel is unlined.

Mail Service Segment

No native or sensitive plants or plant communities are present at the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site. Non-native (exotic) and weedy species are scattered in adjacent unpaved dirt areas. No wetlands or riparian areas are present. The site is not part of a current habitat conservation plan of natural community conservation plan areas. Currently, the site is a paved vacant lot.

b. Wildlife

Run-Through Tracks Segments 1 to 3

The proposed project area provides minimal to no habitat for native wildlife species. Other than scattered vacant lots, there is no open space or natural area within the project site that would support wildlife populations. Any animal species present in the area would include feral domesticated animals and common species that have adapted to the urban environment. In the surrounding area, nocturnal urban mammals visit the Los Angeles River (east of the project site) at night to feed. The river also attracts bird species to the area and provides a fly-way for migrating birds crossing Los Angeles County. Raptor species that are known to acclimate to and forage in developed areas include red-tailed hawks and kestrels. No raptor species were observed within the project site or in the vicinity during the site visit.

A visual inspection was made of the underside of the 1st Street Bridge near the residential lofts off of North Santa Fe Avenue and Santa Fe Street. A swallow’s nest was observed on the top of the bent just below the deck. The nest was whole and intact with nesting material present around the opening. No birds were observed actively using the nest. No bats or evidence of roosting sites were observed.

Mail Service Segment

No wildlife was present or observed on the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site. Within the vicinity of the site, killdeer (*Charádrus vociferous*) nests were documented (in 2000) in the gravel lot of the Crown Industrial Site (at the northeast corner of 16th Street and 15th Street). The gravel lot is located approximately 250 feet northwest of the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site. It is a fenced vacant lot, unpaved with weeds. Killdeer are year-round resident shorebirds in the southern California area. Their most conspicuous characteristics include their call and

broken-wing display used to distract potential predators from their nest or young. Killdeer breed and nest during the summer months (April through August) in coastal and inland habitats that are open and relatively flat. Killdeer nests are shallow scrapes in dirt, gravel, or small rocks. Incubation period is 24 to 28 days; chicks are mobile within 1 or 2 days of hatching, and can take flight about 25 days after hatching.

c. Sensitive Biological Resources

The proposed project Segments 1 to 4 are primarily composed of commercial and industrial uses with scattered residential uses. It is not expected that any species identified as federally or state listed threatened or endangered, candidate, sensitive, or special status occupy or have suitable habitats in the area.

A search of the CNDDDB RareFind2 was conducted for the Los Angeles and Hollywood USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles. A total of 20 individual records of occurrences resulted, with one occurrence (in 1881) for prostrate navarretia (*Navarretia prostrata*) located within one mile of the proposed project area. However, due to the highly developed urban nature of the proposed project area and surrounding area, no habitat that would support the species is present, and the species has most likely been extirpated from the area. An area adjacent to the proposed Mail Transfer Facility at Amtrak's Redondo junction property was identified in 2000 as potential killdeer habitat. The Mail Transfer Facility site does not provide potential habitat because it is paved. No other sensitive plant or animal species have been recently recorded and none are present within the proposed project area.

3-3.2 Environmental Impacts

3-3.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Potential impacts to biological resources were evaluated in terms of direct impacts through disturbance, loss, and/or displacement of any native habitat or communities, wetlands, sensitive federal and state listed plant and wildlife species determined to be present within the project site and the immediate surrounding area.

3-3.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. NEPA Significance Thresholds

NEPA requires assessment of potential environmental impacts on ecological systems, wetlands, and endangered species or wildlife. This analysis uses the criteria in the Department (FHWA) Environmental Handbook Volume 3, Biological Resources, which references the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations approach to determine the significance of impacts on biological resources. Per CEQ Regulations, 1508.27, "significantly" as used in NEPA requires considerations of both context and intensity.

b. CEQA Significance Thresholds

The Department Environmental Handbook also references the CEQA Guidelines approach to determine the significance of impacts on biological resources. The following thresholds were developed from the sample questions for Biological Resources outlined in the Environmental Checklist Form of the 2002 CEQA Guidelines. A project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species
- Substantially diminish habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants
- Create a potential public health hazard or involve the use, production or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to people or animal or plant populations in the area affected.

3-3.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would result in no construction-period impacts from the proposed project to existing biological resources since no native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands, or riparian habitats are present within the primary study area. Other transportation projects that would be built in the area are not likely to create impacts since they would be built in areas with no biological resources.

b. Alternative A

Run-Through Tracks Segments 1 to 3

Construction of Alternative A would result in no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands or riparian habitats since none are present within the project construction areas. Construction of the Union Station modifications would be entirely within the existing developed facilities. Excavation of the columns for the U.S. 101 segment would occur within the highway median. Excavation of the columns for the trestle segment would occur within vacant tracts or occupied property that would be acquired. No impacts to biological resources would occur within these segments since none are present. Construction would not affect the 1st Street Bridge. The project would not affect the Los Angeles River and would not interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species associated with the river. The proposed Mail Transfer Facility site is paved and provides no habitat.

The proposed project would not include the introduction of new species of native plants or wildlife into the area. No limitations to the replenishment of existing species would occur since no native plant or wildlife species are present in the project area. Existing landscaping

associated with the current facilities may be modified as part of this project, but would be limited to non-native (exotic) commercial landscaping plants and groundcover.

The project area is not located within an HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policies or ordinances. The project site contains commercial and industrial uses with a few vacant lots scattered throughout the area. No native trees are present within the project area. Any removal or displacement of parkway trees or landscaping during construction would be coordinated with the City's Public Works Department and permitted per the Street Tree Division policy, to the extent possible.

Mail Service Segment

Killdeer are neither federal nor state listed threatened or endangered, federal candidate or state species of special concern. However, bird nests and actively breeding birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Killdeer nests have been documented in open areas in proximity to the proposed Mail Transfer Facility. However, the proposed project site is asphalt paved and does not contain open gravel or dirt areas that would provide suitable substrate for killdeer to use for nests. The lot to the west of the site and the outermost railroad spur is also paved. The strip of dirt immediately west of the railroad spur tracks is currently in active use for container trailer storage. This use and associated human activity would preclude the use of this strip by killdeer; therefore, the potential is low for killdeer and/or nests to be present near the site. No impacts to biological resources on the proposed mail facility site would result, as no resources are present. Presently, no project-related activity (such as staging) is proposed that would affect the Crown Industrial site northwest of the project site where killdeer were previously observed. No impacts to nesting birds (killdeer) that may be present on the Crown Industrial site would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

c. Alternative A-1

Construction of the Alternative A-1 would result in impacts similar to Alternative A. No adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) would occur to native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands, or riparian habitats since none are present within the project limits, including the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site.

3-3.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would not result in long-term adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) to existing biological resources since no native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands or riparian habitats are present within the project area, including the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site. Long-term impacts associated with other transportation in the area are not expected to be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) due to the lack of biological habitat in the area.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Neither operation of Alternative A nor Alternative A-1 would result in adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) to native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands, or riparian habitats since none are present within the project limits, including the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site.

3-3.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

The potential is low for cumulative biological impacts, given the lack of habitat in the study area. Projects that may affect nesting birds, or the riparian or fish habitat of the Los Angeles River, have some potential for cumulative impacts. However, since it can be reasonably assumed that all projects would be constructed in accordance with federal and state regulations, it is unlikely that cumulative biological impacts would occur.

Development of the proposed project in conjunction with the related transportation projects would not result in or add to loss of open space, vegetation communities, native plants and wildlife, sensitive species, wetland or riparian areas, or affect habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan areas. The proposed project and related projects involve fully developed, urban areas with minimal to no native habitat, open spaces, and sensitive biological resources. Future development of the Crown Industrial site could contribute to cumulative impacts to biological resources if construction were to occur during the breeding season and killdeer nests were present on the site. Mitigation measures to preclude such impacts have been adopted for that project. Overall, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

3-3.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternatives A and A-1

A Section 7 consultation with USFWS under the federal ESA would not be required because no federally listed species are present within the project area. A Section 2081 incidental take permit under CESA would not be required since no state-listed species are present within the project area.

The proposed project would not directly affect waters of the U.S., waters of the state, or wetlands. Therefore, a Section 404 permit, Section 401 water quality certification, and Section 1601 SAA would not be required. Compliance with the requirements with Section 402 of the Clean Water Act and coverage under the NPDES general construction permit are discussed in Section 3.18, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Compliance with requirements under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act would be required if construction involves removal of migratory bird nests during the breeding season.

Compliance with regulatory requirements, along with voluntary compliance with City of Los Angeles street tree policies, would result in no adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA) construction impacts to biological resources.

b. Long Term

Alternatives A and A-1

No regulatory requirements would be applicable during operation of the proposed project. Operation of either alternative would not result in long-term adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) to native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands, or riparian habitats since none are present within the project limits, including the proposed Mail Transfer Facility site.

3-3.3 Potential Mitigation

3-3.3.1 Construction Period

No adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) to biological resources would occur during construction of either Alternative A or Alternative A-1; therefore, no mitigation is required.

As a preventive measure, if construction occurs during the nesting season (generally March to September) and trees would need to be removed, a qualified biologist will investigate any trees to be removed to ascertain whether birds' nests are present. If nests are present, they will be relocated if possible, or work will be managed in the area to avoid disturbing nesting birds.

3-3.3.2 Long Term

No long-term adverse effects (under NEPA)/significant impacts (under CEQA) to biological resources would occur during operation of either Alternative A or Alternative A-1; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3-3.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

Impacts to biological resources during construction or operation of either Alternative A or Alternative A-1 would not be adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA).

3-2 AIR QUALITY

3-2.1 Existing Air Quality and Climate

3-2.1.1 Climate

The climate in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) generally is characterized by sparse winter rainfall and hot summers tempered by cool ocean breezes. A temperature inversion, a warm layer of air that traps the cool marine air layer underneath it and prevents vertical mixing, is the primary weather feature that allows contaminants to accumulate in the SCAB. The mild climatological pattern is interrupted infrequently by periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, and Santa Ana winds. The climate of the area is not unique, but the high concentration of mobile and stationary sources of air contaminants in the western portion, in addition to the mountains that surround the perimeter of the Basin, contribute to poor air quality in the region.

Temperature affects the air quality of the region in several ways. Local winds are the result of temperature differences between the land and ocean. During the day, the land heats up, causing warm air to rise, and pulling cool ocean air inland, tending to keep areas near the coast cooler than farther inland. This is known as the sea breeze effect. During the night, the land cools and becomes cooler than the ocean surface, and the effect is reversed, with winds tending to blow out to sea. This is known as a land breeze.

Temperature also has a major effect on vertical mixing height, and affects chemical and photochemical reaction times. The annual average temperatures vary modestly throughout the Basin, averaging 75°F, with cooler average temperatures near the coast and higher values inland (Western Regional Climate Center 2003). The coastal areas show little variation in temperature on a year-round basis due to the moderating effect of the marine influence. On average, August is the warmest month while January is the coolest month. Most of the annual rainfall in the Basin falls between November and April. Annual average rainfall varies from nine inches in Riverside to 14 inches in downtown Los Angeles.

Wind flow patterns play an important role in the transport of air pollutants in the Basin. The winds flow from offshore and blow eastward during the daytime hours. In summer, the sea breeze starts in mid-morning, peaks at 10-15 miles per hour and subsides after sundown. There is a calm period until about midnight. At that time, the land breeze begins from the northwest, typically becoming calm again about sunrise. In winter, the same general wind flow patterns exist except that summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. This pattern of reversing day/night circulations and low wind speeds is another factor that allows the pollutants to accumulate in the Basin.

3-2.1.2 Air Quality Standards

Air quality for the project area is regulated by National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and State of California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are

summarized in Table 3-2.1. As can be seen in Table 3-2.1, several of the CAAQS are significantly more stringent than the NAAQS for the criteria pollutants.

The CAAQS cover the same six “criteria” air pollutants regulated under the NAAQS, but also include standards for other air pollutants, including sulfates, vinyl chloride, and hydrogen sulfide. These CAAQS-only pollutants are expected to be emitted only in very minor quantities or not at all by project activities, and, therefore, are not addressed further in this document.

Table 3-2.1: Summary of California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards

| Pollutant | Averaging Time | CAAQS | NAAQS |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Ozone | 1-hour | 0.09 ppm | 0.12 ppm |
| | 8-hour | N.A. | 0.08 ppm |
| PM ₁₀ | 24-hour | 50 µg/m ³ | 150 µg/m ³ |
| | Annual arithmetic mean | 20 µg/m ³ (effective 5/03) | 50 µg/m ³ |
| PM _{2.5} | 24-hour | N.A. | 65 µg/m ³ |
| | Annual arithmetic mean | 12 µg/m ³ (effective 5/03) | 15 µg/m ³ |
| CO | 1-hour | 20 ppm | 9 ppm |
| | 8-hour | 9.0 ppm | 35 ppm |
| NO ₂ | 1-hour | 0.25 ppm | N.A. |
| | Annual arithmetic mean | N.A. | 0.053 ppm |
| SO ₂ | 1-hour | 0.25 ppm | N.A. |
| | 3-hour (Secondary) | N.A. | 0.5 ppm |
| | 24-hour | 0.04 ppm | 0.14 ppm |
| | Annual arithmetic mean | N.A. | 0.03 ppm |
| Lead | 30-day average | 1.5 µg/m ³ | N.A. |
| | Calendar quarter | N.A. | 1.5 µg/m ³ |
| Sulfates | 24-hour | 25 µg/m ³ | N.A. |
| Vinyl Chloride | 24-hour | 0.01 ppm | N.A. |
| Hydrogen Sulfide | 1-hour | 0.03 ppm | N.A. |

Notes:

1. N.A. = Not Applicable
2. NAAQS for 1-hour and 8-hour when the daily 2nd highest and daily 4th highest concentrations, respectively, do not exceed the level of the standard. The 1-hour CAAQS is not to be exceeded.
3. The NAAQS for 24-hour PM₁₀ is allowed to be exceeded no more than 1% of the time, while the 24-hour CAAQS for PM₁₀ is not to be exceeded.
4. The NAAQS for 24-hour PM_{2.5} is allowed to be exceeded no more than 2% of the time.
5. The NAAQS for 3-hour and 24-hour SO₂ concentration may be exceeded no more than once per year.
6. The CAAQS for 1-hour NO₂ is not to be exceeded.
7. Other CAAQS not explained in these notes are not to be equaled or exceeded.

Sources: NAAQS from Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50 (CFR 2002a). CAAQS from California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter 5, Article 1. Standards for Ambient Air Quality (CCR 2003)

3-2.1.3 Recent Air Quality Measurements

Data on existing air quality in the SCAB are available from several sources, including the Internet web site of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (<http://www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html>), referred to as the EPA AirData site. This site contains information from designated monitor sites nationwide, and can be used to summarize recent air quality readings in comparison to the NAAQS for each criteria pollutant.

Depending on the pollutant of interest, the EPA AirData site contains data for up to 16 monitoring locations in Los Angeles County. The AirData-listed monitor site nearest the proposed project is located at 1630 North Main Street in Los Angeles, approximately one mile northeast of LA Union Station. The most recent calendar year (2002) monitor data are available from the AirData site for each of the pollutants covered by the NAAQS.

The year 2002 measured criteria (NAAQS) pollutant concentrations for the above-listed monitoring site are summarized in Table 3-2.2 (USEPA 2003). For averaging periods of 24 hours and less, the applicable standards typically allow one or more exceedances per year, with some of the standards (e.g., PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) being in a percentile format. Therefore, the values listed in Table 3-2.2 represent the monitored value that would be compared with the appropriate NAAQS or CAAQS to determine compliance with the standard. Where both a CAAQS and NAAQS apply for a given short-term averaging period, the measured value listed is that which is comparable to the NAAQS.

As shown in Table 3-2.2, the monitor site at 1630 North Main measured concentrations in 2002 that were below all of the NAAQS except for the annual average PM_{2.5} standard of 15 ug/m³. The measured annual average PM_{2.5} concentration was 22.1 ug/m³, nearly 50% over the NAAQS. The measured concentrations at this monitor site were over the CAAQS for 1-hour ozone, 24-hour and annual PM₁₀, and annual PM_{2.5} concentration. Although individual year values exceed the 8-hour ozone NAAQS and the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS, compliance with these NAAQS is based on the average of the most recent three years of data. For both of these standards, the average of the three years of measurements is below the NAAQS.

Table 3-2.2: Comparison of Past 3 Years Air Quality Measurements Near the Project Site with Ambient Air Quality Standards

| Pollutant | Averaging Time | CAAQS | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | NAAQS |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Ozone | 1-hour (2 nd high) | 0.09 ppm | 0.120 ppm | 0.101 ppm | 0.115 ppm | 0.12 ppm |
| | 8-hour (4 th high) | N.A. | 0.085 ppm | 0.075 ppm | 0.077 ppm | 0.08 ppm |
| PM ₁₀ | 24-hour (2 nd high) | 50 ug/m ³ | 79 ug/m ³ | 83 ug/m ³ | 61 ug/m ³ | 150 ug/m ³ |
| | Annual | 20 ug/m ³ | 40 ug/m ³ | 44 ug/m ³ | 39 ug/m ³ | 50 ug/m ³ |
| PM _{2.5} | 24-hr (98 th pct.) | N.A. | 73 ug/m ³ | 58 ug/m ³ | 55 ug/m ³ | 65 ug/m ³ |
| | Annual | 12 ug/m ³ | 21.9ug/m ³ | 22.9ug/m ³ | 22.1ug/m ³ | 15 ug/m ³ |
| CO | 1-hour (2 nd high) | 20 ppm | 6.8 ppm | 5.3 ppm | 4.9 ppm | 35 ppm |
| | 8-hour (2 nd high) | 9.0 ppm | 5.0 ppm | 4.3 ppm | 3.7 ppm | 9 ppm |
| NO ₂ | 1-hour (high) | 0.25 ppm | 0.152 ppm | 0.142 ppm | 0.143 ppm | N.A. |
| | Annual | N.A. | 0.040 ppm | 0.038 ppm | 0.032 ppm | 0.053 ppm |
| SO ₂ | 1-hour (high) | 0.25 ppm | 0.075 ppm | 0.025 ppm | 0.016 ppm | N.A. |
| | 3-hour (2 nd high) | N.A. | 0.009 ppm | 0.010 ppm | 0.010 ppm | 0.5 ppm |
| | 24-hr (2 nd high) | 0.04 ppm | 0.007 ppm | 0.007 ppm | 0.007 ppm | 0.14 ppm |
| | Annual | N.A. | 0.002 ppm | 0.003 ppm | 0.003 ppm | 0.03 ppm |
| Lead | 30-day average | 1.5 ug/m ³ | N.R. ³ | N.R. ³ | N.R. ³ | N.A. |
| | Cal. Qtr. (high) | N.A. | 0.05 ug/m ³ | 0.06 ug/m ³ | 0.03 ug/m ³ | 1.5 ug/m ³ |

Notes:

1. Federal AAQS from Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50.
2. State of California AAQS from California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter 5, Article 1. Standards for Ambient Air Quality.
3. Not Reported. However, it is clear from the quarterly data that the 30-day CAAQS is easily met.

Source: USEPA's AirData web site: <http://www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html>

3-2.1.4 Applicable Plans and Regulations

The California Clean Air Act of 1988, California Health and Safety Code Section 39607 (West 1996) requires air pollution control districts and air quality management districts to develop air quality management plans for meeting state ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide. The California Air Resources Board is responsible for developing a plan for meeting State PM₁₀ Standards.

The South Coast Air Quality District (SCAQMD) has the primary air quality permit authority throughout the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Permit authority is derived from a combination of State and Federal legislation and can be categorized into construction or installation authorizations for individual pieces of equipment and permits for continued operation of equipment facilities.

While the most recent three years of monitoring data for the immediate project vicinity (summarized above) indicate compliance with NAAQS for all except the annual PM_{2.5} standard, the USEPA official designation for the entire SCAB, including the project area, is still “nonattainment” for O₃ (extreme), CO (serious), and PM₁₀ (serious). Therefore, the federal Clean Air Act requires that the state implementation plan (SIP) for NAAQS attainment contain provisions and plans to bring the area into “attainment” for each of these pollutants. Note also that attainment status for PM_{2.5} is expected to be established in late 2004, but from the data above, it appears that the project area will be “nonattainment” for this form of particulate matter. The responsibility for performing the planning and analysis needed to create the necessary Air Quality Maintenance Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB rests with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The AQMP contains the measures (regulations and policies) proposed by the SCAQMD, and approved by USEPA, that are deemed necessary to bring the area into attainment within specified time periods for each pollutant. These measures are wide-ranging, affecting both stationary and mobile sources of pollutant emissions. Because O₃ is produced by precursor pollutants, mainly nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and reactive organic gases (ROGs, also called volatile organic compounds or VOCs), the AQMP contains provisions to minimize these emissions from power plants, motor vehicles, solvent use, and many other sources. CO nonattainment issues are caused mainly by motor vehicles, so the AQMD has provisions for vehicle maintenance and inspection and use of oxygenated fuels to minimize CO generation. PM₁₀ is a product of fugitive dust from transportation and construction activities, direct emissions from stationary and mobile source combustion processes, and “indirect” emissions, meaning particulate matter produced from precursor pollutants such as NO_x and SO₂. The control of PM₁₀ emissions in the AQMP focuses on minimizing the suspension of fugitive dust from construction activities, requiring application of water or other approved dust suppressants to keep particulate matter from becoming airborne.

3-2.2 Air Quality Impacts

The potential magnitude of air quality impacts from a given project can be assessed in terms of the emissions expected from the project, and also in terms of the dispersion and resulting concentrations of pollutants emitted, typically at receptors located in the immediate vicinity of project activities. Given

the nature of the SCAB, pollutants emitted within the entire Basin tend to contribute to overall Basin air quality. Because most of the project-associated emissions (e.g., locomotives traveling throughout the SCAB, construction vehicle deliveries, and worker travel from within the SCAB region) will not tend to be highly concentrated in one area, this document evaluates air quality impacts solely in terms of the magnitudes of expected emissions from the construction and operation phases of the project.

3-2.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The EIS-EIR analysis team estimated emissions of criteria pollutants, plus those of ROG, which are defined as organic compounds that, through chemical reactions in the atmosphere, contribute to the formation of ozone (O₃). Emissions of PM_{2.5} (particulate matter under 2.5 microns in diameter) were not estimated for this study, since the SCAQMD has not yet established emissions significance thresholds. However, PM_{2.5} emissions are a subset of PM₁₀ emissions, and thus, the PM₁₀ estimates can be used as an upper bound of the PM_{2.5} emissions.

Table 3-2.3 provides a summary of the types of emission sources evaluated, and the reference publications from which emission factors, emission factor equations, load factors, or other needed data were obtained for this analysis. Further details of the calculation methodologies, including complete calculation spreadsheets, are provided in the Air Quality Technical Report.

Table 3-2.3: Summary of Emission Factor References for Each Type of Emission Source

| Source/Activity Description | Emission Factor, Equation, and/or Data References |
|---|---|
| Heavy-Duty Non-Road Construction Equipment Exhaust | Equations from Table A9-8 of CEQA Handbook (SCAQMD 1993). Horsepower ratings provided construction schedule subcontractor. Load factors from USEPA Report NR-005A, June 15, 1998 (USEPA 1998a). |
| On-Road Construction Vehicles | EMFAC2002 emission factors (SCAQMD 2003a). |
| Construction Worker Passenger Vehicles | EMFAC2002 emission factors. Vehicle trips and miles from Tables A9-5-A-2 and A9-5-D of CEQA Handbook |
| Fugitive Dust from Vehicle Movement, both On- & Off-Site | Section 13.2.2 of USEPA Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (AP-42), September 1998 (USEPA 1998b) & Section 13.2.1 of AP-42, October 2002 (USEPA 2002a). |
| Fugitive Dust from On-Site Earthmoving, Demolition, and Material Handling | Grading from Table A9-9, Building Demolition from Table A9-9-H, and Excavation from Table 9-9-G of CEQA Handbook. Concrete & Pavement Demolition from Chapter 11.19.2 of AP-42, Jan. 1995 (USEPA 1995). |
| Evaporative ROG Emissions from Asphaltic Paving | Equation from URBEMIS7G User's Guide, October 2000 (Jones & Stokes 2000). |
| Operation-Related Locomotive Exhaust Emissions | USEPA Publication EPA420-F-97-051, Emission Factors for Locomotives, Table 9 (USEPA 1997). |
| Operation-Related Offsets from Passenger Vehicles | EMFAC2002 emission factors. |
| Notes: | |
| 1. CEQA Handbook = South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Handbook, November 1993 update. | |
| 2. EMFAC2002 = California standard emission factor program, published emission factor tables. | |

3-2.2.2 Impact Criteria

The project team evaluated the proposed project for air quality impacts during both the construction and operation phases. The SCAQMD has developed an air quality handbook for documents undergoing the CEQA process. The handbook includes thresholds for emissions

associated with both the construction and operation of a proposed project. If emissions from construction or operation of the project exceed the thresholds after mitigation, then the project is considered significant for air quality purposes. The thresholds are shown in Table 3-2.4.

Table 3-2.4: SCAQMD-Established Thresholds of Air Quality Significance for Operation and Construction of a Proposed Project

| Phase | Pollutant | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | ROG | NO _x | CO | PM ₁₀ | SO _x |
| Operation | 55 lb/day | 55 lb/day | 550 lb/day (1) | 150 lb/day | 150 lb/day |
| Construction | 1.5 ton/qtr 75 lb/day | 2.5 ton/qtr 100 lb/day | 24.75 ton/qtr 550 lb/day | 6.75 ton/qtr 150 lb/day | 6.75 ton/qtr 150 lb/day |
| Notes: | | | | | |
| 1. Exceedances of CAAQS for 1-hour and/or 8-hour periods are also established significance criteria. | | | | | |

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that states develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to bring areas of unacceptable air quality back into attainment with the NAAQS, and to maintain acceptable air quality in areas that were formerly in violation of NAAQS, but which have since improved to better than the standards. The SIPs often specify future emission budgets, along with various air pollution control measures needed to bring NAAQS nonattainment areas into compliance.

Because federal actions may affect the emissions budgets and air quality impacts in nonattainment areas, the CAA provides that federal agencies may not take actions, such as funding or approving construction of a project, that would adversely impact a state or local area's ability to meet its SIP requirements. Further, the CAA requires that the federal agency taking the action conduct specific analyses to determine whether a proposed action would "conform" to SIP requirements. Before such an action may be taken, there must be a "Conformity Determination" on the part of the federal agency. Thus, if a project does not conform to SIP requirements, it would be considered an adverse impact.

3-2.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, there would obviously be no construction-related air pollutant emissions and related impacts due to the proposed project.

b. Alternative A

For Alternative A, construction-period impacts are assessed in terms of emissions estimates by quarter and by day. The Air Quality Technical Report provides these in detail for each quarter, and daily, for each unique weekly activity level. Summarized in Table 3-2.5 are the maximum

emissions of each pollutant, on both a quarterly and daily basis, for such period within the anticipated 2.25-year construction period. The construction period is assumed to begin in 2008 and end in 2010.

The values exceeding the significance thresholds are shown in bold in Table 3-2.5. For NO_x and PM₁₀, both the daily and quarterly maximum estimated emissions exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds. For PM₁₀, over 95 percent of the estimated emissions are due to fugitive dust, primarily from construction vehicles (trucks) traveling on both paved public roads, and on unpaved construction site roads. For NO_x, over 95% of the quarterly and daily maximum emissions are due to construction vehicle exhaust, both from onsite equipment and trucks used to haul materials to and from the site.

Table 3-2.5: Comparison of Estimated Emission Impacts and Significance Thresholds During Construction of Alternative A

| Pollutant | Daily Threshold (lb) | Maximum Daily Emissions (lb) | Quarterly Threshold (tons) | Maximum Quarterly Emissions (tons) |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| CO | 550 | 222 | 24.75 | 7.6 |
| ROG | 75 | 51 | 2.5 | 1.2 |
| NO _x | 100 | 398 | 2.5 | 9.9 |
| SO _x | 150 | 36 | 6.75 | 0.9 |
| PM ₁₀ | 150 | 1115 | 6.75 | 14.4 |

c. Alternative A-1

The estimated emissions impacts for Alternative A-1 are identical to those for Alternative A with respect to the gaseous air pollutants as shown in Table 3-2.5. The maximum PM₁₀ emissions on a daily basis increase slightly, compared to Alternative A, to 1157 lbs., and on a quarterly basis the overall maximum does not increase at all. However, for Quarter 3 of the construction schedule (see Air Quality Technical Report), the PM₁₀ emissions increase slightly from 11.3 tons under Alternative A, to 11.7 tons under Alternative A-1.

3-2.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

The long-term impacts are those due to operation of the proposed project, once construction is complete. For the purposes of this analysis, the comparison of emissions from alternatives is based on year 2025 operations. This analysis of operational air emissions impacts for each scenario considered evaluates only the incremental difference in local (SCAB) emissions from Metrolink trains, which compose the vast majority of trains that would operate over the run-through tracks, together with any offsetting or incremental changes in motor vehicle traffic that would be necessary if the project is not implemented. While Amtrak trains would also be enhanced by project implementation, it is assumed for this analysis that the slight increase in Amtrak service would be accommodated by the existing LAUS design.

a. No-Build Alternative

For the No-Build Alternative, the emissions evaluation is based on the following criteria and assumptions.

- Analysis indicates that the existing LAUS configuration will reach its feasible operating capacity in 2010, accommodating 182 Metrolink trains per day arriving and leaving the station. Therefore, 2025 no-build locomotive emissions are based on 182 trains/day through LAUS.
- If the proposed LAUS improvements are not constructed by 2025, an additional 53 Metrolink trains that would otherwise be accommodated would need to be replaced by other modes of travel (single-passenger cars, carpools, buses).
- Metrolink emissions for 2002 are based on performance test data for model F9-THI Metrolink locomotive engines (SWRI, 1996). Future emissions (2025) are based on USEPA locomotive fleet-average emissions factors (USEPA 1997), projected for implementation of the locomotive emission standards under 40 CFR 92 and modified to reflect Tier III emission reductions for NO_x and PM₁₀ (USEPA, 2003).
- Motor vehicle emissions are based on EMFAC2002 (version 2.2) year 2025 emission factors (most conservative) provided by SCAQMD (SCAQMD, 2003).
- Motor vehicle emissions are also based on the equivalent passengers for 53 trains that would be accommodated by the proposed project, an estimated 258 passengers per train, and the existing modal split for non-train commuters (single-passenger cars/carpools/buses).

Emissions estimates for the No-Build Alternative are provided in Table 3-2.6. Detailed emission calculation spreadsheets to support these data are provided in the Air Quality Technical Report. The emission projections below indicate that even with the increase in locomotive and motor vehicle traffic (vehicles that would otherwise be accommodated by the project), future emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ would be lower than current emissions. This is due to the significant decrease in locomotive emission factors, as a result of USEPA rules to reduce such emissions from new and remanufactured locomotives. Changes in NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions from motor vehicles are accounted for in the calculations. Emissions of pollutants other than NO_x and PM₁₀ are projected to rise above existing levels under the no-build scenario, as the growth in locomotive use and vehicle emissions (that would result if train capacity is not available) more than offsets the slight decreases in emission factors for most of these pollutants related to USEPA rules to reduce such emissions from new and remanufactured locomotives (see Air Quality Technical Report for Details). The No Build alternative would result in emissions that exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold levels for CO, NO_x, and ROG.

Table 3-2.6: No-Build Alternative – Estimated Emissions

| Emissions Component | Metrolink Trains per Day | Pollutant Emissions (lb/day) | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | | CO | NO _x | ROG | SO ₂ | PM ₁₀ |
| Existing (2002) Baseline Metrolink Locomotive Emissions | 126 | 888 | 9,682 | 312 | 96 | 325 |
| 2025 Metrolink Locomotive Emissions (at 2010 LAUS Capacity) | 182 | 1,935 | 1,124 | 393 | 139 | 26 |
| 2025 Addl. Motor Vehicles Emissions if Project NOT Implemented | (equivalent to 53 trains) | 2,685 | 306 | 366 | 7 | 104 |
| Total 2025 No-Build Emissions (Lines 2 + 3) | | 4,620 | 1,430 | 759 | 146 | 130 |

b. Alternatives A & A-1

Under the two alternative run-through track alignments, locomotive emissions would be essentially the same, given that there is not a significant difference in track length (in comparison to region-wide Metrolink track route distances) for these alternatives. Emissions estimates for these alternatives are based on the following assumptions and criteria.

- LAUS Metrolink train volume is projected to increase to 235 per day in the year 2025 if either of the project build alternatives is implemented.
- The basis for emission factors for locomotives and motor vehicles are the same as detailed above for the No-Build Alternative.

As shown in Table 3-2.7, only locomotive CO and ROG emissions are projected to increase from existing 2002 levels under the year 2025 build alternatives. While the Metrolink locomotive volume through LAUS is estimated to nearly double with project implementation, the NO_x, SO₂, and PM₁₀ emission levels drop by an even greater factor (due to the USEPA Locomotive Emissions Standards), resulting in overall decreases in NO_x, SO₂, and PM₁₀ emissions. Alternatives A and A-1 would result in emissions that exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold levels for CO and ROG.

Table 3-2.7: Alternatives A & A-1 Estimated Emissions

| Alternative or Comparison | Metrolink Trains per Day | Pollutant Emissions (lb/day) | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------------|
| | | CO | NO _x | ROG | SO ₂ | PM ₁₀ |
| Existing (2002) Baseline Metrolink Locomotive Emissions | 126 | 888 | 9,682 | 312 | 96 | 325 |
| Alternative A or A-1 (Future 2025) | 235 | 2,498 | 1,451 | 507 | 5 | 34 |
| Increase for 2025 Build vs. 2002 Existing (CEQA Comparison) | 109 | 1,610 | -8,231 | 195 | -91 | -291 |

c. Comparison of Build vs. No-Build Emissions

For purposes of NEPA comparisons, it is important to compare emissions from the project Build Alternative(s) and the project No-Build Alternative. This comparison is provided in Table 3-2.8. The No-Build Alternative emissions are copied from the last line of Table 3-2.6, and the Build Alternatives A and A-1 emissions are copied from the middle line of data from Table 3-2.7. The net differences between Build and No-Build, as shown in Table 3-2.8, indicate that emissions of NO_x in 2025 would be slightly higher with project implementation than without project implementation. Emissions of CO, ROG, SO₂, and PM₁₀ are estimated to be lower with project implementation than without it.

| Table 3-2.8: Build vs. No-Build Alternative Comparison | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------|------------------|
| Alternative or Comparison Description | Pollutant Emissions (lb/day) | | | | |
| | CO | NO _x | ROG | SO ₂ | PM ₁₀ |
| Year 2025 No-Build (includes 182 trains/day plus motor vehicle traffic equivalent to 53 trains/day) | 4,620 | 1,430 | 759 | 146 | 130 |
| Year 2025 Build Alternatives (235 trains/day) | 2,498 | 1,451 | 507 | 5 | 34 |
| 2025 Build Minus 2025 No-Build (lb/day) | -2,122 | 21 | -252 | -141 | -96 |

3-2.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

The pollutants of primary concern for the proposed project are NO_x and PM₁₀, which exceed the significance thresholds for the construction phase, and CO and ROG, which exceed the significance thresholds for the operational phase. The potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project, together with other projects, are addressed separately for each pollutant in the following paragraphs.

PM₁₀ emissions from project construction activities would be due primarily to fugitive dust from earthmoving activities and truck traffic on paved and unpaved haul roads. Any significant cumulative impacts on PM₁₀ concentrations would likely come from another construction project in the immediate vicinity, or essentially adjacent to, the propose project area. This is because PM₁₀ emitted at ground level tends to settle and affect nearby structures, vegetation, and ground surfaces, tending to deplete the emitted plume as it travels downwind. Given that the project area is essentially fully developed, major new construction would likely entail substantial redevelopment of currently developed land, or perhaps installation of additional transportation infrastructure. For the proposed project construction time period, tentatively scheduled for 2008–2010, there are no known major construction projects in the immediate project vicinity.

NO_x emissions are a concern mainly because they are a precursor to ozone, which is formed through photochemical reactions in the atmosphere. NO_x emissions almost anywhere in the SCAB can be a concern with respect to O₃ formation in the basin, due to the slow dilution rate of fresh air entering the SCAB. With respect to construction, NO_x emissions from the project

would not likely add significantly to SCAB total emissions, if one assumes that there is a more or less fixed pool of construction equipment used within the SCAB, and that this equipment is used on various projects, based on scheduling needs.

With respect to project operation, the key issue is the emission budget established by the SCAQMD in its AQMP. If the predicted operations-related emission increases associated with either of the project build alternatives were not included in the SCAQMD emission budget for future year NAAQS O₃ attainment demonstration, then the project could exacerbate efforts to bring the SCAB into attainment with the NAAQS. However, since SCAQMD has already projected, to the best of its ability, SCAB-wide emissions from all sources for future years, there are no additional “cumulative” emissions to add as a result of the project-related operational emissions.

3-2.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

The following sections address the effects on project air quality impacts due to regulatory compliance with various local and national air quality rules. In many cases, the impacts of these rules are not yet quantifiable, but the rules may serve to reduce emissions from the levels projected above.

a. Conformity Requirements

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that states develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to bring areas of unacceptable air quality back into attainment with the NAAQS, and to maintain acceptable air quality in areas that were formerly in violation of NAAQS, but which have since improved to better than the standards. SIPs often specify future emission budgets, with various air pollution control measures needed to bring NAAQS nonattainment areas into compliance.

Because federal actions may affect the emissions budgets and air quality impacts in nonattainment areas, the CAA provides that federal agencies may not take actions, such as funding or approving construction of a project, that would adversely impact a state or local area’s ability to meet its SIP requirements. Further, Section 176(c) of the CAA requires that the federal agency taking the action conduct specific analyses to determine whether a proposed action would “conform” to SIP requirements. Conformity means that:

- A project will conform to an implementation plan’s purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the NAAQS and achieving expeditions attainment of the such standards, and
- A project will not (a) cause or contribute to any new violations of any standard in any area, (b) increase the frequency or severity of any existing standard violation in any area, or (c) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area. The determination of conformity shall be based on the most recent estimates of emissions, as determined by the metropolitan planning organization or other agency authorized to make such estimates.

Federal rules contain two sets of conformity rules: Transportation Conformity (40 CFR 93, Subpart A), and General Conformity (40 CFR 93, Subpart B). The Transportation Conformity rules and procedures apply to highway or transit projects funded or approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), under Title 23 of the United States Code, or Federal Transit Laws. The General Conformity rules and procedures apply to all other federal agency funded or approved projects, except for listed exemptions, that are not covered under the Transportation Conformity rules.

Because the source of funding is not known at this time but could include either FHWA or FTA funds for the LAUS project, and because the project is covered within the RTP (see below), the project has been evaluated under the Transportation Conformity rules. Projects that are included in a conforming Transportation Plan may need to be analyzed for potential CO and PM₁₀ hot spots using USEPA-approved models and procedures. Projects that are not already included in a conforming Transportation Plan may need to be analyzed for potential CO and PM₁₀ hot spots, plus either 1) offsetting emission reductions for any project-related increases of affected pollutants, or 2) a demonstration that the project related emissions, together with other regional emissions, are consistent with emissions budgets established in the applicable Implementation Plan for a Non-Attainment or Maintenance area.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) was consulted on the issue of transportation conformity as it appeared that the project would fit the description of an element listed in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This element allocated \$400,000,000 for future Metrolink improvements slated for implementation in Los Angeles County by 2010. These improvements include both physical projects and fleet additions. Upon review, SCAG concurred that the proposed project is included in the element in the RTP. The proposed project is not currently listed as a specific line item in the most recent 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTIP) amendment. However, in July 2001, the SCRRA provided SCAG with the projected future system-wide Metrolink train operations in the near-term, mid-term, and long-term planning horizons. These future Metrolink projections form the underlying assumptions in the RTIP modeling effort for conformity purposes. The system-wide train projections included 188 daily trains in the near-term, 232 daily trains in the mid-term, and 286 daily trains in the long-term. Of these projections, only the trains from the Inland Empire to Orange County (IEOC) corridor would not travel through Union Station. Subtracting the projected IEOC trains from the system-wide totals, the adjusted projected trains through Union Station that form the underlying basis for the RTIP are 170 in the near-term, 208 in the mid-term, and 256 in the long-term. Because the proposed project is included in an element within the RTP and because the future Metrolink trains that would travel through Union Station under the proposed project form the underlying basis for RTIP, it would be in conformity as a component of a conforming transportation plan.

In addition, the Department is developing the required documentation to list the proposed project in the current RTIP, scheduled for update in 2004.

Under Transportation Conformity rules, regionally significant projects need to demonstrate consistency with the emission budgets established in the applicable Implementation Plan for a Non-Attainment or Maintenance area. Since the emissions profile for the project does not exceed SCAQMD significance criteria (2025 Build minus 2025 No-Build in Table 3-2.8 above),

the project is not considered regionally significant from an air quality perspective. Because the project is not regionally significant from an air quality perspective, a conformity determination is not required under the General Conformity rules. [40 CFR 93.153(b)]

Regarding the potential for the proposed project to result in CO hotspots, the Build Alternatives would result in additional CO emissions basin wide (compared to existing conditions) along the commuter railroad right of way. However, because CO hotspots are largely a function of traffic congestion and because the Build Alternatives would offset roadway travel on freeways and local streets, the Build Alternatives are expected to decrease the potential for congestion-related CO hotspots. In addition, the Build Alternatives do not include parking facilities. Parking facilities of over 500 spaces are potential sources of CO if there is also substantial congestion associated with access to and from the parking facility. It should be noted that when compared to the No Build Alternative in the future, the Build Alternatives would result in a future net decrease in CO, coupled with a decrease in traffic congestion and a reduction in vehicle emissions. Similarly, the Build Alternatives would result in lower levels of PM10 generation when compared to both existing conditions and future No Build conditions, thus decreasing the potential for PM10 hotspots.

In addition to the potential Transportation Conformity or General Conformity requirements above, the following sections address other rules that may serve to reduce project air pollutant emissions for the construction period and operational period.

b. Construction Period

Alternative A

Emissions from construction activities associated with Alternative A would be subject to various types of regulatory mechanisms to control emissions, some already in place, and some currently proposed for rulemaking, as detailed below.

☐ Fugitive Dust

Emissions of fugitive particulate matter (dust) are required to be controlled in accordance with SCAQMD regulations (e.g., Rule 403), specifically under Title IV, Rule 403, Fugitive Dust as amended December 11, 1998 (SCAQMD 2003b).

☐ On-Road Diesel Engines

With respect to gaseous pollutants, the primary regulatory requirements that control emissions from on-road vehicle engines are those applied to the manufacture of new engines. These limits have been phased-in over time by the USEPA (see 40 CFR 86, USEPA, 2002), and are expected to continue forcing fleet average emissions downward. For example, heavy-duty diesel truck engines manufactured in 2003 need to meet a standard of 4.0 grams of NO_x/brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr). In 2004, the standard for the sum of NO_x plus hydrocarbons (largely ROG) drops to 2.4 g/bhp-hr, and in 2007 the standard for NO_x emissions alone from these engines will drop to 0.2 g/bhp-hr, effectively around an order of magnitude decrease.

The same USEPA diesel engine emission standards referenced above will also decrease exhaust particulate matter emissions. The current limit for diesel truck engines is 0.10 g/bhp-hr, while buses are now subject to a standard of 0.05 g/bhp-hr. In 2007, these standards will both drop to 0.01 g/bhp-hr, representing an order of magnitude decrease for trucks and a five-fold decrease for buses. EPA has also issued a rule to decrease the sulfur content for on-road diesel fuel in 2007 from the current 500-ppm maximum, to no more than 15 ppm. This change is being made primarily to prevent fouling of the new emissions control equipment (filters, catalytic converters) needed to meet the new, stringent NO_x, HC, and PM emission standards.

□ Non-Road Diesel Engines

The USEPA emission standards for heavy-duty diesel trucks apply to engines used in vehicles driven on public roads. Another large component of vehicle exhaust emissions is due to non-road vehicles, with construction equipment being a major component of the non-road emissions inventory. The USEPA proposed (Federal Register, May 23, 2003) to implement new non-road diesel engine emission standards starting in 2007, and, for the first time, to also regulate the sulfur content of diesel fuel, including that used in marine and railroad engines. Currently, non-road diesel engines may use fuel containing a maximum of 5000 ppm (0.5%) sulfur by weight. In 2007, EPA has proposed to drop this to 500 ppm (0.05%) and in 2011, to drop this to 15 ppm for all but marine and railroad engines, which would remain at 500 ppm.

In addition to the proposed 2007 emission standards for non-road diesel engines, USEPA implemented NO_x emission standards for non-road diesel engines in 1996, and these have not yet been incorporated in the CEQA Handbook of emission factors (used in the construction emissions analysis described in Section 3-2.2.3) by SCAQMD. The use of the post-1996 NO_x emission factors for non-road construction equipment could reduce fleet emissions by 20–60 percent, depending on the level of newer equipment incorporated into the region's construction fleet. This level of reduction would not decrease construction-related NO_x emission estimates below SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds (see Section 3-2.2.3), but could significantly reduce the emissions estimates.

In the most likely scenario of construction starting in 2008 and being completed in 2010, the newer emissions standards described above would begin to have some effect on reducing emissions from the fleet of over-the-road trucks used in construction projects, and if the proposed non-road engine emission standards are finalized, would also begin to have an effect on construction equipment engines.

Alternative A-1

Regulatory compliance effects on air pollutant emissions from construction emissions will be the same for Alternative A-1 as for Alternative A, as described above.

c. Long Term (Operational)

Alternative A

The regulatory compliance impact on project “operational” or long-term emissions under Alternative A would be that locomotive fleet emissions continue to be reduced over time, due to implementation of USEPA’s 1999 Locomotive Emissions Standards. These standards apply to new and remanufactured locomotives, so the effect is to gradually reduce locomotive fleet average emission rates (USEPA 1997). The effects of these standards are already incorporated in the emission factors used in the emissions impacts analysis described in Section 3-2.2.4. If USEPA’s proposed non-road diesel fuel sulfur standards are implemented, this will further reduce the relatively low locomotive-related SO₂ and particulate matter emissions, incorporated in the net “avoided” emission estimates summarized in Section 3-2.2.4.

Alternative A-1

The regulatory compliance impact on project “operational” or long-term emissions under Alternative A-1 would be the same as for Alternative A, as described above.

3-2.3 Potential Mitigation

Mitigation measures are required only under CEQA. The proposed project meets the Transportation Conformity rules, and because it is not regionally significant from an air quality perspective does not need a conformity determination is not required under the General Conformity rules (see Section 3-2.2.6) for NEPA.

3-2.3.1 Construction Period

a. Alternative A

Section 3-2.2.3 shows that the construction emissions of both NO_x and PM₁₀ would exceed both the daily and quarterly SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds, meaning that mitigation measures must be developed. Potential mitigation measures for NO_x include the following:

- Use of newer onsite construction equipment (which is subject to lower USEPA emissions standards)
- Use of newer on-road diesel trucks (which is subject to lower USEPA emissions standards)
- Shutting off both on-road and non-road diesel engines when not in use for more than 10 minutes.

As described in Section 3-2.2.6, several new USEPA emission standards are being implemented or proposed, which could substantially reduce estimated exhaust NO_x emissions from both on-road and non-road diesel engines used on this project. A possible option might be that construction contractors be required to use newer construction equipment for this project.

However, for a construction project such as this, where various construction subcontractors would be utilized at the same time, it is not feasible to require these types of mitigation measures. To require construction subcontractors to utilize alternative-fueled or new equipment could limit the number of subcontractors available to cost-effectively bid on the proposed project. From a Basin-wide emissions perspective, this type of mitigation measure would simply create a shift of NO_x emissions from one location in the SCAB to another.

One practical mitigation measure to help minimize NO_x (as well as HC and CO) emissions would be to minimize diesel engine idling time by requiring that the engines be shut off when not in use for more than 10 minutes. Given the relatively warm climate, restarting the engines should not be a problem as it can be in colder climates.

Potential mitigation measures for particulate matter include the following:

- Watering of exposed earth, especially onsite haul roads
- Wetting active earth/material piles
- Chemical dust suppressants on temporarily inactive earth/material piles
- Restriction of earthmoving activities during high winds
- Use of newer on-road and non-road construction equipment, which is subject to lower USEPA emissions standards

With respect to particulate matter, onsite fugitive dust mitigation measures (e.g., Rule 403) would be implemented. Specifically:

- Water trucks and other watering activities would be employed when haul trucks and concrete trucks are moving materials onsite, and during all excavation and grading activities.
- Streets would be swept at the end of each day if visible soil were carried onto streets.
- Wheel washers would be installed where vehicles enter and exit construction sites, or truck wheels would be washed down by hoses for each trip off the site.
- Non-toxic soil stabilizers would be applied to inactive constructive areas.

As suggested in Table A11-9-A in the CEQA Handbook, a minimum control efficiency of 34 percent was applied to those activities.

b. Alternative A-1

See the discussion under Alternative A above, with respect to exhaust NO_x emissions from on-road and non-road diesel engines.

With respect to PM₁₀, Alternative A-1 would have the same potential mitigation measures as Alternative A.

3-2.3.2 Long Term

a. Alternative A

The project-related increase (compared with existing conditions) of CO and ROG emissions of more than 1,600 lbs/day and 195 lbs/day exceed the SCAQMD (CEQA) Air Quality Significance Threshold of 550 lbs/day and 55 lbs/day. However, as shown in Table 3-2.9, it becomes apparent that the future Build alternative vs. Existing Conditions would result in less CO and ROG generation than the future No Build vs. Existing Conditions. Although the Build Alternatives would generate future levels of CO and ROG that exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds, these levels would be lower than if a No-Build alternative were implemented. Because criteria pollutant generation under the Build Alternatives would be less than with the No Build alternative, the Build Alternatives can be considered as mitigation for future conditions. Because few practical mitigation measures are available to be applied to commuter locomotive CO and ROG emissions, further mitigation measures are not proposed.

Table 3-2.9: Existing vs. Build vs. No-Build Alternative Comparison

| Alternative or Comparison Description | Pollutant Emissions (lb/day) | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|------------------|
| | CO | NO _x | ROG | SO ₂ | PM ₁₀ |
| Existing Conditions (2002, 126 trains) | 888 | 9,682 | 312 | 96 | 325 |
| No-Build, Year 2025 (includes 182 trains/day plus motor vehicle traffic equivalent to 53 trains/day) | 4,620 | 1,430 | 759 | 146 | 130 |
| Build Alternatives, Year 2025 (235 trains/day) | 2,498 | 1,451 | 507 | 5 | 34 |
| No Build, 2025 vs. Existing Conditions (lb/day) | 3,732 | -8,252 | 447 | -50 | -195 |
| Build, 2025 vs. Existing Conditions (lb/day) | 1,610 | -8,231 | 195 | -91 | -291 |

b. Alternative A-1

See the discussion under Alternative A above.

3-2.4 Impact Results with Mitigation (CEQA Only)

3-2.4.1 Construction Period

a. Alternative A

Under Alternative A, use of water for onsite dust suppression would cut estimated PM₁₀ emissions during the worst-case quarter from 14.43 tons to 12.65 tons, or approximately 12 percent overall. Maximum quarter daily PM₁₀ emissions would be cut from 1115 lb to 977 lb, also approximately 12 percent overall. For both time periods, the mitigated emissions totals would still be well above the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds.

b. Alternative A-1

Worst-case maximum total emissions, with mitigation (watering) applied, would be reduced from 1157 lb to 1019 lb daily (a 12-percent decrease) and from 14.43 tons to 12.65 tons quarterly (12-percent decrease), the same as with Alternative A. The primary difference in PM₁₀ emissions between Alternative A and Alternative-1 occurs during the construction phase, which includes building demolition, which causes slightly higher emissions during that phase for Alternative A-1.

3-2.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

The estimation of operational emissions for Metrolink locomotives includes several assumptions (USEPA locomotive fleet-average emissions factors (USEPA 1997), projected for implementation of the locomotive emission standards under 40 CFR 92 and modified to reflect Tier III emission reductions for NO_x and PM₁₀ (USEPA, 2003). The Tier III reductions cannot be guaranteed to occur. Therefore, from a conservative perspective, it should be considered that a significant CEQA impact related to CO and ROG would remain.

CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

3-1 ACQUISITIONS AND DISPLACEMENTS

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

3-1.1 Existing Conditions

The proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would extend two sets of tracks from Union Station across U.S. 101, providing a new connection into the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) main line on the west side of the Los Angeles River. The proposed project would cross over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101, then traverse a developed urban area to connect to the main line. This area contains a mix of commercial and institutional land uses, with some scattered residential uses. Either of the two build alternatives would traverse parcels that are currently vacant, used for surface parking, and/or are developed with commercial buildings. A more complete discussion of land uses can be found in Section 3-11, Land Use and Planning. Construction of the proposed elevated track structure would involve placing support structures for the elevated rail tracks above existing streets and parcels. Therefore, acquisitions or easements involving public and private parcels would be required, based on the selected alignment.

3-1.2 Environmental Impacts

Impacts to property owners and occupants occur when parcels of private property are partially or fully acquired. Additional impacts occur when those acquisitions result in the displacement of residences or businesses. Impacts may also occur when a business is displaced from a property that is leased. Before mitigation, these impacts would be considered adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA. If, after mitigation (in this case, acquisition at fair market value and application of government relocation programs), the compensation package does not satisfactorily compensate for the effects of displacements, the impacts would be considered adverse under NEPA and significant under CEQA.

3-1.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Several types of acquisitions could occur for the proposed project. Implementation of either of the proposed build alternatives, Alternatives A and A-1, would involve the permanent acquisition

of properties and the possible displacement of persons, businesses, and parking located on those properties. Permanent easements would also be required in some locations. Any acquisitions, displacements, and easements related to the construction of the proposed bridge and trestle are considered temporary in nature. The acquisitions, displacements, and easements necessary for the operation of the proposed corridor are considered to be permanent.

Parcels that appear to be necessary for implementing the build alternatives were identified from conceptual engineering drawings of the two proposed alignments overlaid on maps that show parcel boundaries. To assess potential impacts, the parcels that would need to be acquired for the build alternatives were reviewed for the following circumstances.

- Whether the acquisition would be permanent or temporary
- What type of acquisition would be required (full acquisition or easement)
- Whether the acquisition would include relocation.

Impacts were determined by applying the impact criteria described below to each of the identified parcels.

3-1.2.2 Impact Criteria

Temporary construction easements are defined as those acquisitions of property necessary to permit temporary use of the property for construction staging and equipment storage areas, and for access to utilities and construction sites not otherwise accessible through public rights-of-way.

Permanent acquisitions include both full acquisitions of property, where an entire parcel would be acquired, and partial acquisitions of property, where only a portion of land, landscaping, parking, and/or structure would be acquired.

Full permanent acquisitions would apply to both residential and non-residential properties, and any existing uses on the property would not be expected to continue. Full acquisitions of non-residential uses on the property that are temporarily relocated and returned to the original site after construction has finished are considered to be temporary.

Partial permanent acquisitions would apply to both residential and non-residential properties where only a portion of land, landscaping, parking, and/or structure would be acquired. In such cases, if the portion of property acquired could not be returned to its owner, and existing uses could not resume operation after construction is completed, it would be considered permanent.

3-1.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would not require any full or partial acquisitions of property for the proposed project. Other transportation projects that would occur in the area would require temporary property acquisitions, as defined in the environmental documents for those projects.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

The anticipated construction staging areas for either alternative would all be located within the parcels permanently acquired for the particular proposed alignment. No additional parcels would need to be temporarily acquired for construction staging purposes, except for some possible temporary easements that would be necessary for access to utilities and construction areas. The precise location of the temporary easements would be known with more certainty after final engineering design plans were completed.

Both of the build alternatives would require that temporary construction easements be obtained from several parcels adjacent to the proposed bridge and trestle alignments. Many of the affected properties would already be subject to either permanent or temporary acquisition. The precise locations of any temporary construction easements would be known with more certainty after the final engineering design plans were completed.

In most instances temporary construction easements would not be expected to adversely affect properties in the corridor area. The temporary, periodic nature of construction activities would limit the duration and intensity of the potential effects that construction easements might have on the affected parcels. In addition, the project study area has been fully developed for industrial use; therefore, no sensitive land uses would be affected. The agencies assumed that construction easements would be granted by the City of Los Angeles for either build alternative for any affected streets, including Commercial, Garey, Center, and Ducommun. Consultation with the City of Los Angeles about the proposed project was initiated at the outset of alternatives analysis and is ongoing.

It is also assumed that temporary construction easements would be granted by the BNSF, SCRRA, and MTA for track realignments in their respective properties.

3-1.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

Alternative A and Alternative A-1 would not require the acquisition or displacement of any residential properties. Permanent non-residential acquisitions would involve industrial and warehouse uses, as well as parking facilities and vacant property. For the purposes of this analysis, the assumption is made that acquisitions, displacements, and relocations would be conducted by the Department. Title for any acquisitions is also assumed to be held by MTA, which is typical for public railroad rights-of-way in Los Angeles County. Permanent aerial easements over streets for either build alternative are assumed granted by the City of Los Angeles.

a. No-Build Alternative

For the No-Build Alternative, no acquisitions of property or displacement of businesses would be required for the proposed project. Other transportation projects in the area could require acquisitions and/or displacements, as defined in the environmental documents for those projects.

b. Alternative A

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

For the Alternative A alignment, 11 parcels other than city streets (see Table 3-1.1) would need to be fully or partially acquired, or would necessitate the acquisition of aerial easements, to provide right-of-way in the trestle segment of the project south of U.S. 101. Property information was obtained from *Win2Data* and was verified through field surveys. The Alternative A alignment and the parcels that would need to be acquired are shown on Figure 3-1.1.

| Table 3-1.1: Alternative A Affected Properties | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| APN # | Address | Owner (1) | Use | Acquisition | Displacement |
| 5173-003-009 | 531 E. Commercial St | PBR Realty, LLC (2) | Parking lot | Easement (2) | No (2) |
| 5173-002-010 | 527 E. Commercial St | Chris Chen (3) | Parking lot | Easement (3) | No (3) |
| 5173-003-010 | 620 E. Commercial St | PBR Realty, LLC | Warehouse | Full | Yes |
| 5173-017-004 | 706 E. Commercial St | Keller Street Development Co. | Parking lot | Full | Yes |
| 5173-017-006 | 711 Ducommun St | Friedman Investments, LLC | Warehouse | Aerial easement | No |
| 5173-017-008 | None | Tosco Corp-Dynamic Builders/Urgent Gear | Vacant lot (5) | Full | No (5) |
| 5173-020-010 | None | Richard and Bonnie Viertel | Parking lot | Full | Yes |
| 5173-020-910 | None | LA County MTA | Red Line portal | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |
| 5173-020-907 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant lot | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |
| 5173-020-906 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant lot | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |
| 5173-021-902 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant lot | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |

Table 3-1.1: Alternative A Affected Properties


Notes:

1. Owner as reflected in *Win2Data* as of June 1, 2003.
2. For the purposes of this analysis, the owner of this parcel is assumed to be the California State Department of Transportation (Department) due to their anticipated purchase of the property as a required acquisition for their Route 101 Ramp Realignment Project. Therefore, no displacement of persons or businesses would occur. A construction easement may be required.
3. For the purposes of this analysis, the owner of this parcel is assumed to be the LA County MTA due to their anticipated purchase of the property as a required acquisition for their proposed MTA Yard Lead Project. Therefore, no displacement of persons or businesses would occur. A construction easement may be required.
4. These parcels are already owned by the LA County MTA, therefore, no acquisitions are required. A construction easement may be required.
5. Pursuant to case #DIR-2003-5815-SPR, conditional approval to Dynamic Builders for a 57,320 sq. ft. warehouse building with 11,104 sq. ft. of office space was approved on November 04, 2004. The tenant will be Urgent Gear.

Source: Win2Data, 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

The bridge across U.S. 101 for this alternative is assumed to occur within the Department's right-of-way. An easement across that right-of-way for the new railroad bridge is assumed provided. This alignment would require full acquisition of the industrial warehouse property located at 620 E. Commercial Street and the large vacant lot owned by ~~Teseo Corp~~ Conoco Phillips at the corner of E. Commercial and Center Streets. A conditional approval was granted by the City of Los Angeles in November 2004, for the purposes of building a 57,320 sq. ft. warehouse building with 11,104 sq. ft. of office space on that site. The Viertel parking impound lot between Commercial and Ducommun Streets (500 Center Street) and the 706 E. Commercial Street parking lot would need to be acquired,¹ in order to place columnar supports for the trestle. Because of these business displacements, assistance would be provided in accordance with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (Uniform Act).

¹ This analysis assumes "Full Acquisitions" in order to estimate the worst-case scenario costs for acquisitions and displacements. It may also be possible to negotiate leases/easements for the use of these parcels, combined with permanent easement for operations, as an alternative to full acquisition.



Source: © 2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-1.1: Parcels to be Acquired for Alignment A

For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the parcel at 531 E. Commercial Street, currently owned by PBR Realty LLC, will be purchased by the Department as a required acquisition for their U.S. 101 freeway realignment project and, thus, would not need to be acquired for the purposes of this project.

It is also assumed that the property located at 527 E. Commercial Street would be purchased by the MTA for their Eastside LRT project; therefore, it, too, would not need to be acquired for this project. However, easements over both of these properties may need to be obtained for construction.

In addition to the acquisitions required for this alternative, operation of the proposed corridor would require that easements be permanently acquired in certain areas. Unlike the temporary construction easements described above, these easements would be necessary to permit permanent use of a portion of the affected properties. Permanent easements would need to be obtained (or retained) across the 531 E. Commercial Street property as well as the 527 E. Commercial Street property. An aerial easement over the Friedman Bag Company facility at 711 Ducommun Street would also need to be obtained.

Other permanent easements could also be required to permit permanent use of a portion of the affected properties, usually for access to utilities such as the sanitary sewer and the storm drain system. The precise locations of any other permanent easements would be known with more certainty after completion of final engineering design plans, which would occur after completion of the environmental process.

The acquisition of permanent easements dedicated to underground utilities would not likely have an adverse effect on properties along the alignment. Permanent easements for utilities would involve the use of only a portion of the affected property and typically would not entail substantial alterations to the physical character of the property. It would be highly unlikely that the day-to-day operation of uses on these properties would be disturbed by permanent utility easements. Only very occasional disruptions from the presence of utility workers or maintenance personnel would be apparent to property owners and occupants.

c. Alternative A-1

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

The Alternative A-1 alignment would be similar to Alternative A, but would be located primarily north of Commercial Street. A total of 8 parcels other than city streets would be affected by this alignment. Table 3-1.2 lists the parcels that would need to be fully acquired or would necessitate the acquisition of easements. The Alternative A-1 alignment and the parcels that would need to be acquired are shown on Figure 3-1.2.

This alignment would require the acquisition and demolition of commercial property at 801 Commercial Street, as well as the full acquisition of the vacant parcel at 516 Aliso Street. The Viertels’ parking impound lot between Commercial and Ducommun Streets (at 500 Center Street) would also need to be acquired, in order to place columnar supports for the trestle. These acquisitions, and assistance in relocating the business therein, would be provided in accordance with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Property acquisition would be at fair market value, as established by appraisal. It is assumed that property acquisitions and relocation assistance procedures would be conducted by the Department.

For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the parcel at 531 E. Commercial Street, currently owned by PBR Realty LLC, would be purchased by the Department as a required acquisition for their U.S. 101 freeway realignment project and, thus, would not need to be acquired for the purposes of this project.

Table 3-1.2: Alternative A-1 Affected Properties

| APN # | Address | Owner (1) | Land Use | Acquisition | Displacement |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 5173-003-009 | 531 E. Commercial St | PBR Realty LLC (2) | Parking lot | Easement (2) | No (2) |
| 5173-018-001 | 516 Aliso St | PBR Realty LLC | Vacant | Full | No |
| 5173-019-006 | 801 E. Commercial St | Friedman Bag Company Inc. | Heavy industrial | Full | Yes |
| 5173-020-907 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |
| 5173-020-905 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |
| 5173-020-010 | 500 Center Street | Bonnie and Richard Viertel | Impound lot | Full | Yes |
| 5173-020-902 | 840 E. Commercial St | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |
| 5173-021-902 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |

Notes:


1. Owner as reflected in *Win2Data* as of June 1, 2003.
2. For the purposes of this analysis, the owner of this parcel is assumed to be the Department due to its anticipated purchase of the property as a required acquisition for their U.S. 101 Ramp Realignment Project. Therefore, no displacements of persons or businesses would occur. A construction easement from the Department may be required.
3. The parcels are already owned by MTA.

Source: Win2Data, 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

As with Alternative A, other permanent easements could also be required to permit permanent use of a portion of the affected properties, such as for access to utilities. The precise locations of these permanent easements would be known with more certainty once the final engineering design plans are completed. These easements would not be likely to have an adverse effect on most properties along the proposed corridor because they would involve the use of only a portion of the affected property and typically would not entail substantial alterations to the physical character of the property. It would be highly unlikely that the day-to-day operation of uses on these properties would be disturbed by permanent utility easements. Only very occasional disruptions from the presence of utility workers or maintenance personnel would be apparent to property owners and occupants.

3-1.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Other than the Department U.S. 101 widening project and MTA Eastside LRT Project mentioned above, the only other project proposed in the vicinity of the study area is the new police headquarters site. This project would be located on the parcel bounded by Alameda Street, Temple Street, Vignes Street, and 1st Street, which is often referred to as the Mangrove Estates site. All three projects would be constructed on currently vacant properties, and thus would not involve the displacement of businesses other than parking. Therefore, no cumulative negative impacts or displacements are anticipated as a result of the proposed developments in the area. Future redevelopment of vacant parcels that may result from the Department, MTA, or Run-Through Tracks Projects would be under the guidance of the City of Los Angeles planning process.



Source: © 2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-1.2: Parcels to be Acquired for Alignment A-1

3-1.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period and Long-Term Acquisitions

The potential effect of property acquisitions would be substantially mitigated through compliance with applicable federal and state laws governing property acquisition procedures. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (Uniform Act) (42 U.S.C. § 4601–4655), mandates that certain relocation services and payments be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced as a direct result of programs or projects undertaken by a federal agency or with federal financial assistance. The Uniform Act provides for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes or businesses who are eligible for assistance and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies. Generally, the Uniform Act requires that all aspects of property acquisition, including notice, appraisal, negotiation, and payment, be as reasonable and fair as possible and be handled as expeditiously as practicable.

According to section 6018 of the Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Guidelines (California Code of Regulations), the provisions of the California Relocation Act (California Act) (Government Code sections 7260-7277) shall apply in the absence of federal funds and/or involvement if a public entity undertakes a project and consequently must provide relocation assistance and benefits. The California Act, which is consistent with the intent and guidelines of the Uniform Act, seeks to (1) ensure the consistent and fair treatment of owners of real property, (2) encourage and expedite acquisitions by agreement to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, and (3) promote confidence in public land acquisitions.

b. Construction-Period and Long-Term Relocation Assistance

The Uniform Act requires both financial assistance and programmatic assistance to eligible displaced persons, businesses and non-profits, as described below.

Financial Assistance: Eligible displaced businesses and non-profit organizations are entitled to compensation for: reasonable moving expenses, direct losses of tangible personal property (not to exceed the cost of moving such property), expenses of searching for replacement property and expenses of reestablishing a small business or non-profit (not to exceed \$10,000). In lieu of the foregoing payments, a displaced business or non-profit can elect to receive a fixed relocation assistance payment of between \$1,000 and \$20,000.

Programmatic Assistance: Eligible displaced persons, businesses and non-profit organizations are entitled to certain programmatic assistance in addition to monetary compensation. This assistance takes the form of coordinated relocation planning and counseling and may include recommendations on replacement housing or new business locations, information on other government assistance programs, and any other advisory services that may minimize the hardships of relocation. Programmatic assistance also would include the provision of certain “last resort” housing in the event that comparable replacement housing that is decent, safe, and sanitary is not available to displaced persons.

3-1.3 Potential Mitigation

3-1.3.1 Construction Period: Alternatives A and A-1

It is assumed that no properties would need to be temporarily acquired for construction staging purposes; therefore, no mitigation measures are required during this phase. If properties were to be temporarily acquired for staging, those acquisitions would be governed by the Uniform Act or the California Act. Temporary construction easements would be negotiated in accordance with the Uniform Act and/or the California Act.

3-1.3.2 Long Term: Alternatives A and A-1

Government policies on property acquisition and relocation assistance described in Section 3-1.2.6 will be applied to acquisitions and displacements. The potential effects of property acquisitions and displacement of businesses would be substantially, if not completely, alleviated through compliance with the Uniform Act (if federal funds are used for the project) and/or the California Act.

In addition, prior to and during the construction period, the Department would disseminate information to affected property owners and the general public regarding the proposed corridor, including information about the potential temporary acquisitions and displacements. Public information will be distributed through staff liaisons, Internet web sites, fax and e-mail updates, brochures and mailings, and community meetings.

3-1.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-1.4.1 Construction Period

a. Alternative A and A-1

Because no properties would need to be temporarily acquired for construction staging purposes for Alternative A or A-1, no impacts would occur.

3-1.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternative A

The full acquisition of private property associated with the implementation of the proposed Alternative A alignment would result in the displacement of ~~three~~ four businesses. Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. Potential property acquisitions and displacements would be subject to both the Uniform Act (if federal funds are used for the project) and the California Act and would thus be mitigated to a less-than-adverse effect (under NEPA)/less-than-significant level (under CEQA).

b. Alternative A-1

The full acquisition of private property associated with the implementation of the proposed Alternative A-1 alignment would result in the displacement of one business (801 Commercial Street) and the disruption of business activities at one other property located at 500 Center Street. Potential property acquisitions and displacements would be subject to both the Uniform Act (if federal funds are used for the project) and the California Act and would thus be mitigated to a less than adverse effect (under NEPA)/less-than-significant level (under CEQA).

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES

This chapter summarizes the alternatives screening process used to identify the feasible project alternatives that are the subject of this environmental document.

2-1 POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES AND SCREENING

The development of project alternatives occurred in three stages: Initial Screening, Second-level Screening, and a Supplemental Screening.

2-1.1 Initial Screening

An Initial Screening Process was developed to identify and screen out concepts with obvious major engineering and environmental constraints or potential fatal flaws. Two sets of initial screening criteria were developed: one for engineering issues and one for environmental issues.

2-1.1.1 Initial Engineering Screening Criteria

The Initial Engineering Screening Criteria below were used to conduct the initial evaluation of the first round of conceptual alternatives.

- Maximum Horizontal Curve: 12 degrees-30 minutes; Radius: 139.99 meters (459.28 feet) (based on maximum passenger track speed of 25 miles per hour),
- Maximum Vertical Grade: 4 percent, and
- Minimum Vertical Clearance: 7.1 meters (23 feet-6 inches) over railroads; 5.03 meters (16 feet-6 inches) over freeways or major arterial roadways; 4.57 meters (15 feet-0 inches) over secondary roadways.

2-1.1.2 Initial Environmental Screening Criteria


The Initial Environmental Screening Criteria below were used to conduct the initial evaluation of the first round of conceptual alternatives.

- Likely Adverse Effects to Section 4(f) properties, which are afforded special protection by 49 U.S.C. § 303. Either direct or constructive use (through significant impacts) of these properties would require proof that no feasible and prudent alternatives exist that would avoid the use. The Section 4(f) properties for this study were historic structures that included Union Station, the 1st Street Bridge, and several loft buildings.
- Conflicts with other transportation projects. The following is a list of transportation projects that would conflict with some of the alternatives considered for the project:

- U.S.101 freeway widening and ramp reconfiguration project (by the California Department of Transportation [Department])
 - Eastside Light Rail Extension (by Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority)
 - Pasadena Gold Line (by Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority)
 - Widening of 1st Street Bridge (by City of Los Angeles)
 - Commercial Street Widening (by Los Angeles Department of Transportation)
 - Union Station traffic circulation improvements (by Catellus).
- Conflicts with entitled development projects. Any conceptual alignment that uses property that has been granted entitlement rights for a development project was not advanced in the screening process. The Mangrove Estates Development Project,¹ which was located in the southeast quadrant of Alameda Street and Temple Street, was identified as one of the development projects that would conflict with the proposed project.
 - Noise or vibration impact. Any conceptual alignments within 50 feet (15.2 meters) of a residential or noise-sensitive property were considered to cause non-mitigatable noise and/or vibration impact.

The study area for Initial Screening was bounded on the north by Mission Junction, on the south by East 4th Street, on the east by the Los Angeles River, and on the west by Alameda Street. A total of 48 conceptual alignments were developed for initial screening within the Initial Screening study area (see Figure 2-1). All 48 conceptual alignments were evaluated based on the engineering and environmental screening criteria established for the initial screening process. See Table 2-1 for the results of the Initial Screening process.

¹ Since the screening process was conducted, the Mangrove Estates site has been acquired by the City of Los Angeles for development of various public facilities.



Source: HDR, Inc., 2002.

Figure 2-1: Initial Screening Study Area

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 1A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, curves down the northern portion of the property adjacent to Commercial St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 23^{\circ} 34'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | | Possible conflict with design of new 110 ramps at N. Garey | | |
| 1B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves down the northern portion of the property adjacent to Commercial St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 19^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | | | | |
| 2A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, curves down center of Commercial St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 16^{\circ} 51'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | | Conflicts with Commercial Street Widening | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 2B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves down center of Commercial St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 19^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | | Conflicts with Commercial Street Widening | | |
| 3A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, curves on a skew between Commercial St. and Ducommun St., crosses Center Street, curves north of the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | | | | |
| 3B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves on a skew between Commercial St. and Ducommun St., crosses Center Street, curves north of the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 14^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | | | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 4A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S. 101, curves between Commercial St. Ducommun St. (Northern portion of adjacent property), crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | | | | |
| 4B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S. 101, curves between Commercial St. and Ducommun St. (Northern portion of adjacent property), crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | | | | |
| 5A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S. 101, curves between Commercial St. and Ducommun St. (Southern portion of adjacent property), crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | | | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

| Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 5B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves between Commercial St. and Ducommun St. (Southern portion of adjacent property), crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | | | | |
| 6A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, curves down center of Ducommun St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 13^{\circ} 46'$ | $Gr_{max} > 4\%$ | | Conflicts with Light Rail Project | | | |
| 6B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves down center of Ducommun St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} > 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Conflicts with Light Rail Project | | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 7A | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | | |
| 7B | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | | | | |
| 8A | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | | | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 8B | From station Tracks 9-12. Crosses U.S.101, curves down the center of the south half of the block parallel to Jackson St. to the north, crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line and flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | |
| 9A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, curves down center of Jackson St., crosses Center street, curves over the MTA Red Line and flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | | | |
| 9B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves down center of Jackson St., crosses Center street, curves over the MTA Red Line and flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

| Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 10A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S. 101, curves down the center of the north half of the block parallel to East Temple St. to the north, crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red line and flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | |
| 10B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S. 101, curves down the center of the north half of the block parallel to East Temple St. to the north, crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red line and flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | | | |
| 11A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S. 101, curves down the center of the south half of the block parallel to East Temple St. to the north, crosses Center Street, Curves over the MTA Red Line, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Environmental Screening | | | Noise Vibration Impacts |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 11B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S. 101, curves down the center of the south half of the block parallel to East Temple St. to the north, crosses Center Street, Curves over the MTA Red Line, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | | | |
| 12A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S. 101, curves down center of East Temple St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | | Within 50' of Mortuary | |
| 12B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S. 101, curves down center of East Temple St., crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | | Within 50' of Mortuary | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 13A | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | |
| 13B | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street Bridge Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 14A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, curves down the center of the south half of the block parallel to Banning St. to the north, crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property |
| 14B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, curves down the center of the south half of the block parallel to Banning St. to the north, crosses Center Street, curves over the MTA Red Line, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building.) | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 15A | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development |
| 15B | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 16A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple and Banning Streets before curving down the center of the south half of the block parallel to 1st. Street to the north, it then crosses Center St., curves over the MTA Red Line Maintenance shops, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 10^{\circ}$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | Within 50' of Buddhist Temple |
| 16B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple and Banning Streets before curving down the center of the south half of the block parallel to 1st. Street to the north, it then crosses Center St., curves over the MTA Red Line Maintenance shops, flies over 1st Street, and connects back into the SCRRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect for structure above historic 1st Street. Bridge. Likely adverse effect from acquisition of historic building. | Potential Conflict with 1st Street Bridge Widening | | Within 50' of Buddhist Temple |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Environmental Screening | | | Noise Vibration Impacts |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | | |
| | | 17A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, and Banning Streets before curving down the center of 1st., it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 17^{\circ} 24'$ | | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Conflicts with Light Rail Project | |
| 17B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, and Banning Streets before curving down the center of 1st., it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Conflicts with Light Rail Project | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 18A | <p>From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, and Banning Streets before curving down the center of the northern portion of the south half of the block parallel to 1st. Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$D_{max} = 10^\circ$</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | <p>Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic</p> | | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> |
| 18B | <p>From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, and Banning Streets before curving down the center of the northern portion of the south half of the block parallel to 1st. Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRR main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$D_{max} = 12^\circ 30'$</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | <p>Conflicts with properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic</p> | <p>Conflicts with El Monte Busway</p> | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 19A | <p>$D_{max} = 10^\circ$</p> <p>From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, and 1st Streets before curving down the center or the southern portion of the north half of the block parallel to 2nd. Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | | <p>Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic</p> | | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> |
| 19B | <p>$D_{max} = 12^\circ 30'$</p> <p>From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, and 1st Streets before curving down the center of the southern portion of the north half of the block parallel to 2nd. Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | <p>Conflicts with El Monte Busway</p> | <p>Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic</p> | | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> | <p>Within 50' of residential property</p> | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 20A | <p>$D_{max} = 10^\circ$</p> <p>From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, and 1st Streets before curving down the center of the south half of the block parallel to 2nd. Streets to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | | <p>Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic</p> | | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> |
| 20B | <p>$D_{max} = 12^\circ 30'$</p> <p>From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, and 1st Streets before curving down the center of the south half of the block parallel to 2nd. Streets to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | <p>Conflicts with El Monte Busway</p> | <p>Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic</p> | | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> | | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | Noise Vibration Impacts |
|-------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | |
| | | 21A | <p>From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning and 1st. Streets before curving down the center of 2nd, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> <p>$D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$</p> | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic | | |
| 21B | <p>From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning and 1st. Streets before curving down the center of 2nd, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> <p>$D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$</p> | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Some properties on south side of 1st Street are probably historic | | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

| Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 22A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, 1st and 2nd. Streets before curving down the center of the north half of the black parallel to 3rd. Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 10^\circ$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect to historic building. (201 Santa Fe) | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development |
| 22B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, 1st and 2nd. Streets before curving down the center of the north half of the black parallel to 3rd. Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 12^\circ 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect to historic building. (201 Santa Fe) | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria

| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 23A | <p>From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, 1st and 2nd Streets before curving down the center of the south half of the block parallel to 3rd Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$D_{max} = 10^\circ$</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | <p>Likely adverse effect to historic buildings. (212/215 Santa Fe)</p> | | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> |
| 23B | <p>From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, 1st and 2nd Streets before curving down the center of the south half of the block parallel to 3rd Street to the north, it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street.</p> | <p>$D_{max} = 12^\circ 30'$</p> | <p>$Gr_{max} < 4\%$</p> | <p>Likely adverse effect to historic buildings. (212/215 Santa Fe)</p> | <p>Conflicts with El Monte Busway</p> | <p>Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development</p> | <p>Within 50' of residential property</p> | |

Table 2-1: Initial Screening

| Shaded Cell = Does not meet criteria | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Concept No. | Description | Engineering Screening Geometry | | | Environmental Screening | | | |
| | | Maximum Horizontal Curve (degrees) | Maximum Vertical Grade (percent) | Minimum Vertical Clearance | Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Property | Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | Noise Vibration Impacts |
| | | 24A | From station Tracks 3-6, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, 1st and 2nd Streets before curving down the center of 3rd., it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | | Likely adverse effect to historic building. (St. Xavier) | |
| 24B | From station Tracks 9-12, crossing U.S.101, and parallels the vacated Hewitt Street crossing Commercial, Ducommun, Jackson, Temple, Banning, 1st and 2nd Streets before curving down the center of 3rd., it then crosses Santa Fe Avenue, curves over the MTA Red Line maintenance shops, and connects back into the SCRRA main tracks before 4th Street. | $D_{max} = 12^{\circ} 30'$ | $Gr_{max} < 4\%$ | Conflicts with El Monte Busway | Likely adverse effect to historic building. (St. Xavier) | | Conflicts with Mangrove Estates Development | Within 50' of residential property |

Sources: HDR, Inc. and Myra L. Frank & Associates, 2002.

2-1.1.3 Results of Initial Screening

As summarized in Table 2-2 below, 41 of the 48 concepts did not meet the Initial Screening criteria and were eliminated from further consideration based on the engineering and/or environmental screening criteria.

| Table 2-2: Results of Initial Screening | |
|--|---|
| Screening Criteria | Concepts Rejected |
| Maximum Horizontal Curve (Exceeded) | 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3B, 6A, and 17A |
| Maximum Vertical Grade (Exceeded) | 6A and 6B |
| Minimum Vertical Clearance (not met) | 1B, 2B, 3B, 4B, 5B, 6B, 7B, 8B, 9B, 10B, 11B, 12B, 13B, 14B, 15B, 16B, 17B, 18B, 19B, 20B, 21B, 22B, 23B, and 24B |
| Likely adverse effect to historic property | 11A, 11B, 12A, 12B, 13A, 13B, 14A, 14B, 15A, 15B, 16A, 16B, 22A, 22B, 23A, 23B, 24A and 24B |
| Conflicts with other Transportation Projects | 2A, 2B, 6A, 6B, 11B, 12A, 13A, 16A, 16B, 17A, and 17B |
| Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects | 14A, 14B, 15A, 15B, 17A, 17B, 18A, 18B, 19A, 19B, 20A, 20B, 21A, 21B, 22A, 22B, 23A, 23B, 24A, and 24B |
| Noise Vibration Impacts | 12A, 12B, 14A, 14B, 15A, 15B, 16A, 16B, 17A, 17B, 19A, 19B, 21A, 21B, 22A, 22B, 23A, 23B, 24A, and 24B |

Sources: HDR, Inc. and Myra L. Frank & Associates, 2002.

The seven conceptual alignments that were identified as potentially feasible alternatives deserving further consideration were concepts 3A, 4A, 5A, 7A, 8A, 9A, and 10A.

- Concepts 3A, 4A, and 5A define a corridor that traverses south across U.S.101, then turns east between Commercial Street and Ducommun Street, then turns south again crossing the MTA’s Red Line and proposed Eastside LRT maintenance spur before connecting back into the SCRRA’s main tracks near 1st Street. Since each concept seeks to identify an ideal alignment with the least impacts within a defined corridor (500 feet wide), they were combined into one alternative (Alternative A) for further design refinement and environmental analysis in the Second Screening described below.
- Similarly, concepts 7A and 8A define a corridor that traverses south across U.S.101, Commercial Street, and Ducommun Street, before turning east between Ducommun Street and Jackson Street. They then turn south, again crossing the MTA’s Red Line, proposed Eastside LRT maintenance spur, and 1st Street before connecting back into the SCRRA’s main tracks near 4th Street. These concepts were combined into one alternative (Alternative B) for further design refinement and environmental analysis in the Second Screening.

- Concepts 9A and 10A, while in close proximity to each other, had very different impacts and were further analyzed as separate alternatives (Alternative C and Alternative D, respectively) in the Second Screening.

2-1.1.4 Other Alternatives/Issues Considered

Two alternatives to the basic concept of the Run-Through Tracks Project were evaluated as part of the Initial Screening process: a bridge over U.S. 101 and then elevated trestle sections of various lengths and alignments. These alternatives and the reasons for their rejection are described below.

a. Depressing U.S.101 and the El Monte Busway

At the location where the proposed run-through tracks cross the freeway, there are 12 lanes of traffic: 7 freeway mainline lanes (4 westbound and 3 eastbound), an entrance ramp from Commercial Street, an exit ramp to Alameda Street, two bus-only lanes (El Monte Busway) and one frontage street to the north. The approximate difference in elevation between the top of rail on the western-most track and the adjacent bus lane is 17.5 feet (5.3 meters). In order to provide the required 16.5 feet (5.0 meters) from the bottom of the proposed railroad bridge to the top of existing surface of the adjacent bus lane, the freeway, ramps, and bus lane would need to be depressed approximately 5 to 6 feet.

All conceptual alternatives that include lowering the freeway or busway were eliminated from further consideration based on the following:

- Major impact to the general traveling public during construction
- Conflict with the planned U.S.101 widening project
- Potential impact to the existing Metro Red Line subway tunnel
- Impacts to current bus line service at Patsouras Transit Center.

b. Los Angeles River Crossing

Several possible conceptual alignments were investigated that would have swung out over the Los Angeles River and tied back into the SCRRA main line on the west side of the river, between the existing levee and the tracks. The concepts would require bridge piers in the river channel and modifying the levee.

This alternative was eliminated from further consideration based on the following:

- Potential impacts to the flood channel
- Conflict with the planned flood control improvements
- Potential impact to the existing power transmission line adjacent to the river

- Visual impacts
- Conflict with proposed recreational improvements along the river.

2-1.2 Second Screening

The four alignments resulting from Initial Screening were refined to a conceptual (15 percent) level of design. The alignments were re-screened using more detailed screening criteria to identify recommended alternatives to be carried forward to preliminary engineering (35 percent design) and a detailed environmental analysis process.

2-1.2.1 Alternatives

The alignments that passed the Initial Screening (Concepts 3A, 4A, 5A, 7A, 8A, 9A, and 10A) were reviewed and merged as discussed in Section 2-1.1.C above, and then defined as the following four alternatives:

a. Alternative A (incorporating Concepts 3A, 4A, and 5A)

This alternative would extend new tracks south from LAUS Tracks 3 through 6 on a bridge structure across U.S. 101, then continue on a trestle structure that would turn east between Commercial Street and Ducommun Street. The trestle would begin turning south near Center Street, crossing over the MTA Red Line Tunnel alignment and proposed Eastside LRT maintenance spur before descending back to grade to connect to the SCRRA main track before 1st Street (see Figure 2-2).

b. Alternative B (incorporating Concepts 7A and 8A)

This alternative would extend new tracks south from LAUS Tracks 3 through 6 on a bridge structure across U.S. 101, then continue on a trestle structure southward across Commercial Street and Ducommun Street. The trestle would turn east between Ducommun Street and Jackson Street, then turn south again near the east end of Jackson Street, crossing above the MTA Red Line maintenance spur and the proposed Eastside LRT maintenance spur, and then fly over the 1st Street Bridge. The alignment would descend back to grade to connect to the SCRRA's main tracks near 4th Street (see Figure 2-3).

c. Alternative C (incorporating Concept 9A)

This alternative would extend new tracks south from LAUS Tracks 3 through 6 on a bridge structure across U.S. 101, then continue on a trestle structure southward across Commercial Street and Ducommun Street and through portion of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) property. The alignment would then turn east along the center of Jackson Street. Near the east end of Jackson, the alignment would turn south, crossing above the MTA Red Line maintenance spur and the proposed Eastside LRT maintenance spur, and then fly over the 1st Street Bridge. The alignment would descend back to grade to connect to the SCRRA's main tracks near 4th Street (see Figure 2-4).

d. Alternative D (incorporating Concept 10A)

This alternative would extend new tracks south from LAUS Tracks 3 through 6 on a bridge structure across U.S. 101, Commercial Street, then continue on a trestle structure southward across Commercial Street and Ducommun Street. The alignment would then turn east down the north half of the block parallel to East Temple Street. Near the east end of Temple, the alignment would turn south, crossing above the MTA Red Line maintenance spur and the proposed Eastside LRT maintenance spur, and then fly over the 1st Street Bridge. The alignment would descend back to grade to connect to the SCRRRA's main tracks near 4th Street (see Figure 5).

2-1.2.2 Second Screening Engineering Criteria


For the Second Screening of Alternatives, the following engineering and operations screening criteria were defined:

a. Track Design/Geometrics

- Track design is based on SCRRRA and AREMA standards
- Alternatives should accommodate two tracks
- Vertical curve criteria are based on vertical acceleration
- Alternatives will not include electrification considerations
- Alternatives must accommodate central traffic control (CTC) operations
- Track centers (run-through tracks): 16 feet-0 inches (4.88 meters) minimum
- Maximum degree of horizontal curve: 12 degrees
- Maximum grade: 3.5 percent
- Vertical clearances: 23 feet-6 inches (7.2 meters) (minimum) above tracks, 16 feet-6 inches (5.0 meters) (minimum) above U.S. 101 and 15 feet-0 inches (4.6 meters) (minimum) above secondary roadways
- Track design speed: 25 miles per hour.

b. Rail Operations

- Union Station must remain in service during construction
- Improved train performance.



Source: HDR, Inc., 2002.

Figure 2-5: Alternative D

c. Impact to Union Station

- Platform length: At minimum, shall match the existing platform lengths.
- Platform grade: 0.15 percent (maximum)
- Platform raise: (Platforms Nos. 3 and 4) 6.0 ft. (1.8 meters) (maximum)
- Inter-track retaining wall (between Tracks 6 and 7): The limit of retaining wall should be minimized
- Baggage handling facilities: Replacement to current baggage handling facilities should be considered
- Station track modifications: Impacts to existing station tracks should be considered and minimized.

d. Impact to BNSF

- During construction: Impacts to train operations during construction
- After construction: Impacts to train operations after construction.

e. Impact to SCRRRA

- During construction: Impacts to train operations during construction
- After construction: Impacts to train operations after construction.

f. Impact to Metro Rail

- During construction: Impacts to train operations during construction
- After construction: Impacts to train operations after construction.

g. Train Performance/Run Time Differentials

- Time differentials: The running time differential between build alternatives and the No-Build Alternative (using train handling simulations) provide a quantification of time savings.
- Scheduling flexibility: Alternatives should provide flexibility to reduce train movement conflicts and more fully utilize available capacity, such as trains arriving/departing from north to south, south to north and south to south.
- Safety: Alternatives must ensure the ability to safely stop and control train movements in both uphill/downhill directions when operating from both the locomotive and cab cars.

h. Structural Considerations

- Bridge structure should provide for Cooper E-80 loading
- Bridge design would utilize a mid-span support at the U.S. 101 crossing
- Standard bridge segments would be designed for the remainder of the alignment structure (where possible)
- The span arrangement and type of structures would be further evaluated during the Advance Planning Study (APS) and Type Selection stages
- Performance:
 - Straddle Bent Column – Straddle bent column was used in cases where the column must span over rail and vehicular traffic due to horizontal clearance limitation. This would result in a longer span bent. A straddle bent is more susceptible to torsional force and seismic loading in comparison to a conventional bent; therefore, it has more propensity for damage. Straddle bent column should be avoided whenever possible.
 - Excessive Skew Angle – The skew angle is defined as the angle between the centerline of the bent and the line normal to the centerline of the flyover track. A bridge with a high skew has higher possibility of damage during a seismic event, and should be avoided if possible.
- Cost Effectiveness:
 - Non-Standard Span – The structure should be laid out to use standard girders as much as possible. The use of standard girders not only saves the design effort, but also saves construction cost and expedites the construction schedule. The greater the number of standard girders used in the alternative, the better the alternative is.

i. Local Operating Considerations

- Bus lanes were required to continue service to Alameda Street
- Permanent road closures were not permitted (1st Street, Jackson Street, Ducommun Street, etc.):
- Existing lane widths and street configurations, including parking spaces, were to be maintained
- Impacts to local traffic operation were to be minimized or avoided
- Impacts to local parking (on streets or in parking lots) were to be minimized or avoided.

j. Other Considerations

- Utility Impacts: Utility relocation and associated costs should be minimized
- ROW Acquisitions: Property acquisition should be minimized
- Cost: Overall construction/re-construction costs should be minimized.

2-1.2.3 Second Environmental Screening Criteria

For the Second Screening, the general environmental measures used in the Initial Screening were more specifically defined, as follows.

a. Likely to have an Adverse Effect to a Historic Property

For the purpose of the Second Screening, historic properties were defined as:

- Any property currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
- Any property previously found eligible for listing on the NRHP
- Properties then under evaluation by the consultant team that appeared eligible for the NRHP, but which had not yet been submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer for an official determination of eligibility.

For the Second Screening, the Historic Impact Screening Criteria were defined as a series of questions:

- Would the proposed alignment include acquisition of an historic property?
- Would the proposed alignment be likely to have an Adverse Effect (as defined under 36 CFR Part 800 et seq) on an historic property?. Adverse Effects might arise from changes in the character-defining features of the historic property, setting, or other consideration that made the property eligible for historic designation. (The decisions of likely adverse effect were based on the experience of study team members familiar with the historic properties and context of the study area, and past experience with the SHPO in formal determinations of effect.)

b. Conflicts with Other Transportation Projects

The revised list of proposed and planned transportation projects that were considered to be a conflict included:

- U.S. 101 freeway widening and ramp reconfiguration project (by the Department)
- Eastside Light Rail Extension (by Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority), including both the revenue alignment on Alameda Street and service leads along Ducommun Street

- Pasadena Gold Line (by Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority)
- Widening of 1st Street Bridge (by City of Los Angeles)
- Commercial Street widening between Alameda and Center Streets (by Los Angeles Department of Transportation)
- Union Station traffic circulation improvements (by Catellus)
- High Speed Rail conceptual terminal locations for Union Station (by California High Speed Rail Authority)
- MAGLEV conceptual terminal location for Union Station (by Southern California Association of Governments)
- Existing city streets.

Note that the final location for the proposed High-Speed Rail (HSR) connection for Union Station has not been finalized. For the purposes of this screening, three concepts for the HSR station were used:

- North-south elevated platforms above the Union Station tracks
- East-west elevated platforms located south of and parallel to U.S. 101, west of Hewitt Street and north of Commercial Street
- North-south elevated platforms between U.S. 101 and 1st Street, running parallel to and on the west side of the Los Angeles River.

The MAGLEV program being studied by the Southern California Association of Governments assumes that MAGLEV station platforms would be built above the LAUS track complex, probably two levels up above Tracks 10 through 12. In the study area, the tentative MAGLEV alignment, drawn from previously published documents, was assumed to run from the end of Track 10, southward to the intersection of 1st and Garey Streets. North of Temple Street, this alignment would pass to the west of Garey Street, through the east end of the DPW property. For the purposes of the Second Screening, it was assumed that the MAGLEV alignment would be of sufficient height to pass above any of the proposed run-through track alignments.

It was noted that the City of Los Angeles requested that the screening criteria include conflicts with existing transportation facilities. This criterion was included in the second round of screening.

c. Conflicts with Entitled Development Projects

This criterion remained the same as in the first round of screening: any concept that uses property entitled for a development project would not be considered.

d. Characteristics of Property Acquisitions (New Criteria)

For the purposes of the Second Screening, it was assumed that property acquisitions would be “full-takes”, i.e., an entire parcel would be acquired, except where it is clear that the proposed run-through tracks could be accommodated within an easement. Whether or not a lesser acquisition could occur would be determined during subsequent detailed evaluation of the final set of alternatives.

Meetings with some stakeholders in the area revealed that some individual properties are linked to others for operational purposes. Two examples of this are the Department of Water and Power and the Friedman Bag Company. In addition, some properties that were potential acquisitions were known or suspected to include hazardous materials. Although hazardous materials investigations had not yet been initiated, for the purposes of the second screening, all properties that included manufacturing, materials storage or underground tanks were assumed to be hazardous material sites.

Three criteria to address these issues were developed:

- Identify the number of individual properties subject to acquisition
- Identify the number of properties that were linked to others for functional purposes
- Identify the number of properties that were assumed to include hazardous materials.

e. Produces Noise and Vibration Impacts

For the Second Screening, alignments were analyzed to determine whether they would be likely to create a noise impact for a residential property, or to create a noise or vibration impact for other types of properties. The property at 611-615 Ducommun Street included a residential use and the property at 801 Commercial Street was being considered for conversion to lofts. In addition, discussions with stakeholders in the area revealed at least one commercial property that included vibration-sensitive equipment. Although specific noise and vibration impacts had not been predicted, for the purposes of the Second Screening, a 50-foot (15.2 meters) distance either side of an alignment was assumed to include a noise or vibration impact. The criteria were revised to include:

- A noise or vibration impact was assumed if an alignment was within 50 feet (15.2 meters) of a residential, planned residential, or Section 4(f) noise-sensitive property
- A noise or vibration impact was assumed if an alignment was within 50 feet (15.2 meters) of a noise- or vibration-sensitive activity (for any type of property).

f. Visual Impacts

Potential visual impacts can be assessed from two basic perspectives. First, how would an elevated structure affect the overall visual character of the neighborhood? For the overall visual character analysis, it was assumed that the longer or higher a structure, the greater the impact.

Secondly, the visual impact to specific properties must be considered if the visual setting of that property is an important component of its setting or function. The latter category is one of the criteria used in determining whether an adverse effect occurs to an historic resource. It is also used in assessing whether a constructive use occurs in the Section 4(f) analysis procedures. The criteria for visual impacts were thus defined:

- Identify the general length and height of elevated structures. Longer and higher structures were assumed to create greater negative impacts to the neighborhood.
- Identify whether elevated structures would produce negative impacts for specific properties, with two subcriteria:
 - Identify whether an elevated structure would be likely to yield adverse impacts to historic properties.
 - Identify whether an elevated structure would create a constructive use under Section 4(f).

2-1.2.4 Results of Second Screening

Table 2-3 summarizes the results of the Second Screening. The first two stages of alternatives analysis process resulted in identification of an alignment (Alternative A) which had a small number of negative impacts while meeting both the purpose and need and design criteria of the proposed project. Aerial structures over the historic 1st Street Bridge were associated with the Alternatives B through D alignments and would have likely created an adverse effect under Section 106 evaluation criteria. Alternative A was the only alignment that did not require an aerial structure over the historic 1st Street Bridge and thus avoided the likely adverse effect. Alternative A also had fewer environmental impacts than other of the screened alignments, including the need to acquire property from active businesses, visual impacts, and the need to cross a possible hazardous materials site.

| Table 2-3: Alternative Evaluation Matrix | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Alternatives ▶ | Alt A | Alt. B | Alt C | Alt. D |
| Screening Criteria ▼ | Commercial / Ducommun Sts. | Ducommun / Jackson Sts. | Jackson St. | Jackson / E. Temple Sts. |
| Engineering / Operational Screening | | | | |
| Track Design / Geometrics | | | | |
| Maximum Curvature | Low | High | High | Medium |
| Maximum Grade | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Vertical Clearance | Medium | Low | Low | High |
| Track Design Speed | Low | Low | Low | Low |

Table 2-3: Alternative Evaluation Matrix

| Alternatives ▶ Screening Criteria ▼ | Alt A Commercial / Ducommun Sts. | Alt. B Ducommun / Jackson Sts. | Alt C Jackson St. | Alt. D Jackson / E. Temple Sts. |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Rail Operations | | | | |
| Impact to LAUS | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Impact to BNSF | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Impact to SCRRRA | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Impact to Metrorail | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Train Performance / Run Time | Medium | Low | Low | High |
| Structural Considerations | | | | |
| Performance | High | Low | High | High |
| Cost Effectiveness | Medium | Low | Low | High |
| Local Traffic Circulation / Parking | | | | |
| Impact to Local Traffic | Medium | Medium | High | High |
| Impact to Local Parking | Low | Low | High | High |
| Environmental Screening | | | | |
| Likely Adverse Effect to Historic Properties | Low | High | High | High |
| Conflict With Transportation Projects | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Conflicts With Entitled Development Projects | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Characteristics Of Property Acquisitions | Low | High | High | High |
| Noise And Vibration Impacts | Medium | High | High | Medium |
| Visual Impacts | Medium | High | High | High |
| Other Screening Criteria | | | | |
| Utility Impacts | Medium | Low | High | High |
| Cost Considerations | Medium | Low | High | High |

Source: HDR, Inc. and Myra L. Frank & Associates, 2002.

2-1.3 Supplemental Screening

Upon reviewing the anticipated impacts for Alternative A at the end of the Second Screening, the question arose as to whether a variation(s) of that alignment could be developed that captured its benefits, while avoiding the conflicts with the planned Commercial Street widening and minimizing right-of-way impacts to businesses along the Alternative A alignment.

To create an alignment that would be farther north than Alternative A, it became clear that the concept of crossing the freeway with a single structure that accommodated two tracks (consolidated from four tracks adjacent to Platform Nos. 2 and 3) was constraining curvatures and grades in the vicinity of Commercial Street. A concept to carry four tracks across the freeway would allow the alignment to shift closer to U.S. 101. Four variations of this concept were considered as described below.

Alternative A-1 (see Figure 2-5) would extend south from Union Station on a long elevated structure (a combination of bridge and trestle). Leaving the station platform area, the elevated structure would cross U.S. 101, carrying four tracks, and turn eastward while consolidating to two tracks on an alignment situated immediately north of Commercial Street. It would cross above the MTA Red Line Tunnel near Center Street, and then turn south again to cross over Commercial Street and north end of the BNSF yard trackage. The elevated structure would descend to an at-grade connection with the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street.

Alternative A-2 (see Figure 2-6) would also extend south from Union Station on a long elevated structure. Leaving the station platform area, the four-track elevated structure would cross U.S. 101 and then turn eastward on an alignment situated just north of Commercial Street. The structure would transition from four tracks to two tracks at about N. Vignes Street. The alignment would continue east and then begin to turn south as it crosses Center Street. East of Center Street the alignment would pass south of the building at 801 Commercial Street, spanning diagonally over the intersection of Commercial Street and Center Street on a long through-truss bridge span. The alignment would continue to turn south, passing north of the MTA Red Line tunnel entrance before crossing over the north end of the BNSF yard trackage. The elevated structure would descend to an at-grade connection with the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street.

Alternative A-3 (see Figure 2-7) would extend south from Union Station on a long elevated structure. Leaving the station platform area, the four-track elevated structure would cross U.S. 101 and then turn eastward on an alignment situated just north of Commercial Street. The structure would transition from four tracks to two tracks at about N. Vignes Street. The alignment would continue east and then begins to turn south as it crosses Center Street. East of Center Street the alignment would pass south of the building at 801 Commercial Street, spanning diagonally over the intersection of Commercial Street and Center Street on a multiple-span bridge. The intersection of Commercial Street and Center Street would be realigned to accommodate the piers of the multiple-span bridge. The alignment would continue to turn south, passing north of the MTA Red Line tunnel entrance before crossing over the north end of the BNSF yard trackage. The elevated structure would descend to an at-grade connection with the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street.

Alternative A-4 (see Figure 2-8) would extend south from Union Station on a long elevated structure. Leaving the station platform area, the four-track elevated structure would cross U.S. 101 and then turn southeastward, transitioning from four tracks to two tracks at about N. Vignes Street. The structure would cross diagonally over Commercial Street on a multiple-span bridge with outrigger bents that span across the entire width of the street. The alignment would continue southeast and then begin to turn south as it crosses Center Street. The alignment would continue to turn south, passing over the MTA Red Line tunnel entrance before crossing over the north end of the BNSF yard trackage. The elevated structure would descend to an at-grade connection with the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street.

Alternatives A-1 through A-4 were evaluated based on the following factors:

- Railroad alignment – Curvatures that allow for less right-of-way acquisition
- Railroad alignment – Grade vs. train performance

- Structural performance – Evaluation of structural characteristics
- Structural cost effectiveness – Cost-effectiveness of structural features
- Impact to local traffic – Permanent effects to local traffic
- Parking capacity reduction – Loss of on-street parking supply
- Utility impacts – Level of utility impacts and relocations required
- Impacts to environmentally sensitive areas – Alignment areas include potential hazardous materials sites
- Construction costs – Relative comparison of projects construction costs
- Impacts to planned projects – Conflicts with site development or public projects
- Right-of-way impacts – Estimated amount of encroachment or acquisition required
- Impacts to historic resources – Effects to historic architectural resources or archaeological resources
- Noise and vibration – Potential for noise and vibration effects on the function of adjacent parcels
- Visual impacts – Negative effects of spanning city streets, and especially how the intersection of Center and Commercial Streets would be crossed.

Table 2-4 below details the weighted evaluation rankings for Alternative A-1 through A-4.




Figure 2-6: Alternative A-1




Figure 2-7: Alternative A-2




Figure 2-8: Alternative A-3




Figure 2-9: Alternative A-4

As can be seen in Table 2-4, Alternative A-1 scored the highest in this evaluation and was recommended for further consideration along with Alternative A. Alternative A-1 presented the lowest cost while causing the least impacts to traffic, parking, and other transportation projects in the area. It also creates the least visual impact to city streets, as it did not require a larger-scale structure across the Commercial/Center intersection. Further details on the supplemental screening process are contained in Draft Alternatives Report – Supplemental Alternatives Considered (HDR, Inc. 2003).

Table 2-4: Supplemental Evaluation of Alternatives

| Evaluation Factor | Weight | Potential Alignment Alternatives | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | A-1 | | A-2 | | A-3 | | A-4 | |
| | | Rating | Score | Rating | Score | Rating | Score | Rating | Score |
| Railroad Alignment – Curvature | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Railroad Alignment – Grade | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Structural Performance | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Structural Cost Effectiveness | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Impact to Local Traffic | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Local Parking Capacity Reduction | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Utility Impacts | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Area | 2 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Construction Cost | 3 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Impacts to Planned Projects | 3 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Right-of-Way Impacts | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Impacts to Historic Features | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Noise and Vibration Impact | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Visual Impacts | 3 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| | Total Score | | 77 | | 52 | | 44 | | 42 |

Notes:
 Weight Factors Range: 1-3; Lowest weight = 1, Highest weight =3
 Rating Factors Range: 1-3; Lowest rating =1, Highest rating = 3
 Score = Weight x Rating.

Source: HDR, Inc. and Myra L. Frank & Associates, 2002.

2-1.4 Screening of Bridge Design Alternatives

A bridge type evaluation was performed for proposed bridge crossing of the U.S. 101 for the run-through tracks as part of Alternative A. The evaluation, documented in the *Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project – Bridge Type Selection Report* (HDR, Inc. 2003) identified the optimum type of structure for the various segments of the elevated run-through tracks structure. The structure was divided into 12 sections that extend from Union Station to the BNSF yard just north of the 1st Street Bridge. The extent of each section is described below.

- Section 1: U.S. 101 Crossing
- Section 2: U.S. 101 Off-Ramp (between Off-ramp and Commercial Street)
- Section 3: Commercial Street and Garey Street Crossing
- Section 4: Warehouse Crossing (between Garey and Vignes Streets)
- Section 5: Vignes Street Crossing
- Section 6: Friedman Bag Crossing
- Section 7: West of Center Street Crossing
- Section 8: Center Street Crossing
- Section 9: Light Rail Crossing (east of Center Street)
- Section 10: BNSF Separation Crossing
- Section 11: BNSF Yard
- Section 12: Approach

Note that through the balance of this document the elevated structure in Section 1 is referred to as a “bridge.” The elevated structures for Sections 2 through 12 are collectively referred to as a “trestle” or the “trestle segment.”

In recommending a bridge type for each of the above track sections, anticipated construction cost, maintenance cost, and construction schedules were considered. The bridge types considered included precast/prestressed concrete box girder (PC/PS), cast-in-place box girder (CIP), steel deck-plate girder (DPG), steel through-plate girder (TPG), steel truss (ST), and mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) structures. Not every type was considered for each section.

Each section was rated across the above parameters and a total ranking by alternative developed. The highest-ranking bridge type for each section was then selected. Table 2-5 summarizes the recommended bridge types for each section for Alternatives A and A-1.

Table 2-5: Bridge Type Selection by Section

| Section | Alternative A | Alternative A-1 |
|------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Section 1 | DPG | DPG |
| Section 2 | MSE | DPG |
| Section 3 | DPG | DPG |
| Section 4 | PC/PS | PC/PS |
| Section 5 | PC/PS | PC/PS |
| Section 6 | TPG | DPG |
| Section 7 | PC/PS | DPG |
| Section 8 | DPG | DPG |
| Section 9 | DPG | PC/PS |
| Section 10 | TPG | TPG |
| Section 11 | PC/PS | PC/PS |
| Section 12 | MSE | MSE |

Notes:
 DPG = Deck-plate girder
 MSE = mechanically stabilized earth
 PC/PS = Precast/Prestressed concrete
 TPG = through-plate girder

Source: Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project – Bridge Type Selection Report, HDR, Inc., 2003.

2-1.5 Candidate Alternatives

As discussed above, the Initial and Second Screening exercises recommended one alternative, Alternative A, to be carried forward for further evaluation. The Supplemental Screening effort evaluated four additional alternatives that improved upon Alternative A in that they reduced the amount of right-of-way that would be acquired. The Supplemental Screening exercise recommended Alternative A-1 to be carried forward for further evaluation.

The two identified alternatives, Alternative A and Alternative A-1, in conjunction with the No-Build Alternative, are the candidate alternatives for the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project and are the subject of this environmental document. Both alternatives would be composed of the respective bridge types (by segment) as indicated above in Section 2-1.4 . Detailed descriptions of these candidate alternatives are provided below.

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

2-2 DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

This section describes the following project alternatives analyzed in this environmental document: No-Build Alternative, Alternative A, and Alternative A-1.

2-2.1 No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, the existing “stub-end” rail configuration at the LAUS would remain. The No-Build Alternative includes the SCRRRA’s 5th Lead Project that has been approved and is currently under construction. The 5th Lead provides additional capacity for movement through the throat area of LAUS by extending the existing lead No. 1, but makes no changes to other parts or functions of the system. The No-Build Alternative includes other approved transportation projects in the vicinity that could be implemented regardless of whether the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project were built. Other projects are the Department’s U.S. 101 widening, the MTA Eastside LRT project, the City of Los Angeles Commercial Street widening, and the 1st Street Bridge widening. Additional information on these projects is provided in Section 2-4, Related Projects.

2-2.1.1 Physical Components

The No-Build Alternative would not involve additional trackage improvements to LAUS.

2-2.1.2 Operational Characteristics

Based on projected growth in regional passenger rail demands, this “stub-end” station configuration of the No-Build Alternative would be a major constraint to providing increased service levels and reliability to meet the projected demand. Currently, all trains that make passenger exchanges at LAUS must switch ends and operate in the reverse direction upon departure. This movement requires additional time for the crew to make the necessary changes, and the time that the train has to backtrack at yard speeds also reduces efficiency.

LAUS currently serves an average 159 revenue passenger trains each weekday, consisting of 126 SCRRRA ² intra-city commuter trains (Metrolink), 25 Amtrak *Pacific Surfliner* service trains, and 8 Amtrak long-haul intercity trains. According to the State Rail Plan, annual Amtrak ridership is forecast to increase by 52 percent, from 1,662,000 to 2,518,000 by 2011. Daily round-trip *Pacific Surfliner* service would increase from 11 to 16 trains between Los Angeles and San Diego, from 4 to 6 between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara/Goleta, and from 1 to 2 trains extended beyond Goleta to San Luis Obispo. In addition, SCRRRA anticipates substantial increases in demand for commuter rail service for the region. Working forecasts from SCRRRA indicate that ridership through Union Station would reach about 37,000 passengers by 2010, and over 60,000 passengers by 2025. This would require that 56 commuter trains be added by 2010 (for a total of 185), and another 52 added between 2010 and 2025.

² Source: SCRRRA , Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service, 6/24/02. (This number excludes Inland Empire-Orange County trains, which do not pass through Union Station).

The projected level of commuter train activities at Union Station in 2025 could not be supported under the No-Build Alternative, resulting in significant delays in commuter rail services and additional regional traffic on the freeway and roadway system.

2-2.2 Alternative A

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

- Alternative A would extend some bi-directional running tracks from the existing stub-end yard track configuration at LAUS to the south and east to provide “run-through” capabilities for 4 of the 10 stub-end tracks at LAUS. The extension would involve construction of a railroad bridge span over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The elevated rail structure would continue south then east between Commercial Street and Ducommun Street from U.S. 101 to the vicinity of the BNSF West Bank Yard, where the tracks would transition to grade and reconnect to the existing SCRRA mainline tracks (north of 1st Street) along the west bank of Los Angeles River. .

Figure 2-10 shows the overall alignment of Alternative A.

SCRRA and Amtrak executed an agreement on September 11, 2000, stating that maintenance of the run-through tracks would be shared between SCRRA and Amtrak based upon usage of the tracks.

2-2.2.1 Physical Components

Alternative A has four distinct segments that extend from north to south. Segment 1 represents the physical changes that would occur at LAUS. Segment 2 is the crossing of the run-through tracks over the U.S. 101. Segment 3 would be the trestle structure that extends east and south from the U.S. 101 to the SCRRA tracks at the BNSF yard. Segment 4 would be the new Mail Transfer Facility. These four segments are used in Chapter 3 to help the reader understand where impacts occur.

a. Segment 1: Union Station Segment

Segment 1 improvements would consist of various track, platform, service road, and station improvements, including the following:

- Modifications to switches and tracks in the “throat” area where the trains enter LAUS in order to provide appropriate access to new LAUS platforms,
- Elimination of the existing Mail Transfer Facility along the northeastern side of LAUS to accommodate new passenger platforms (the Mail Transfer Facility would be relocated to Segment 4).



Source: Imagecat, Inc., June 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-10: Overall Alignment of Alternative A

- Construction of new platforms (Platform Nos. 7 and 8) and reintroduction of tracks (Tracks 13, 14, 15, and 16) at the east end of the station
- Elevation of existing platforms (Platform Nos. 2 and 3) and the associated tracks (Tracks 3, 4, 5, and 6) to accommodate the bridge over U.S. 101 for the run-through tracks
- Reconstruction of the service/baggage handling road at the south end of the platforms
- Reconstruction of the passenger tunnel access facilities (ramps and associated elements) to accommodate the new and reconstructed platforms
- Construction and reconstruction of accessory facilities such as retaining walls, switches, turnout tracks, and other elements necessary for rail operation.
- Figure 2-10 and Figure 2-11 show the proposed Segment 1 project components.

LAUS Throat Modifications

Various modifications to tracks and switches in the “throat” area would have to occur to accommodate the proposed project (see Figure 2-10). Track Leads 2 and 3, as well as the station tracks they serve (Tracks 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively), would have to be raised to accommodate elevated Platform Nos. 2 and 3 (described below).

Since two new platforms (Platform Nos. 7 and 8) and four new tracks (Tracks 13, 14, 15, and 16) would be added to the station (described below), the switching and turnout configuration in the throat area at the north end of LAUS would have to be modified to accommodate the new platforms and tracks. These modifications would include the removal of several existing crossovers, turnouts, and escape tracks, and the construction of new switches, crossovers, turnouts, and track leads.

In addition, throat area modifications would include portions of a retaining wall between Tracks 6 and 7 to support the elevated track leads and tracks.


Mail Transfer Facility Removal

The existing mail and express operations along Track 13 on the northeastern end of LAUS would be eliminated and relocated to a new mail transfer facility at the Amtrak Redondo Junction yard on 16th Street. Typically, 7 mail cars and 9 to 13 express cars load and/or unload at this facility on any given day. The inbound rail cars arrive at LAUS in the morning. Mail is transferred to trucks and transported to other postal locations in the late morning. Outbound mail is transferred to the mail transfer facility by trucks in the afternoon and loaded onto rail cars, which depart the facility in the early evening.

The existing mail transfer facility (raised dock and shed) would be demolished.


New Platform Nos. 7& 8 and Reintroduction of Associated Tracks

Two new platforms, Platform Nos. 7 and 8, as well as new tracks (Tracks 13, 14, 15, and 16) would be constructed at the east end of the station (near the MTA Building) in an area currently utilized by the mail transfer facility and for truck storage (see Figure 2-11). Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would be approximately 1,200 feet (365 meters) and 1,030 feet (314 meters) in length, respectively. The new platforms would have ADA-compliant ramps and stair access from the existing passenger tunnel. The platforms would include canopies that match the existing canopies on other platforms. Figure 2-12 shows a schematic of the new platforms and Figure 2-13 shows a cross section of the new platforms.



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-13: Proposed New Platforms, Plan View



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-14: Proposed New Platforms, Cross Section View

Elevation of Platform Nos. 2 & 3 and Associated Tracks

Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and their associated tracks (Tracks 3, 4, 5, and 6) would be reconstructed and elevated by approximately 5 feet (1.5 meters) to provide clearance for the run-through tracks bridge over U.S. 101. The existing platforms and tracks would be demolished or removed and reconstructed after a grade elevation to about 5 feet (1.5 meters) higher than the current condition. Figure 2-14 shows the new platform configuration. The track and platform elevation increases are required to provide a minimum clearance of 16.5 feet (5.0 meters) between the bottom of the run-through tracks bridge and the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. A retaining wall would be constructed to support the four elevated tracks and two platforms. Figure 2-15 also shows a cross section view of the reconstructed platforms, including the retaining wall.

Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be approximately 945 feet (288 meters) and 1,065 feet (324 meters) in length, respectively. The reconstruction of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would include the addition of stairs near the north ramp of the passenger tunnel and new ADA-compliant ramps, as well as redesigned stair access at the south end. The south end of the two reconstructed platforms would curve eastward to match the curvature of the run-through tracks bridge over U.S. 101. Existing canopies would be repaired and reused, and new canopy sections would be added at the north and south ends of the platforms.

Modifications to the Passenger Tunnel and Ramps

The north ramps of the existing passenger tunnel (to Platform Nos. 2, 3, 7, and 8) would be modified to provide ADA-compliant ramps to the platforms. The tunnel access to the ramps would be widened and stairs would be provided.

Reconfiguration of the Baggage and Service Roads

The existing service road at the south end of the platform area would be reconfigured and depressed by up to 15 feet (4.6 meters) from the current grade to provide adequate clearance beneath the new run-through tracks bridge structure for baggage vehicles and operations. The new depressed service road would also include a baggage car access road. The service and access roads would return to grade at the southeastern corner of the platform area. Retaining walls would be constructed along the southwestern and southern portion of the platform area, adjacent to the service/baggage road. Once the baggage road returns to grade, it would provide access to the platforms. Figure 2-16 and Figure 2-17 show upper and lower level plan views of the service and baggage road. Figure 2-18 shows a cross section view.

Construction and Reconstruction of Accessory Facilities

Accessory facilities such as switches, turn-outs, escape tracks, control facilities, safety/warning facilities, and other elements that support the station improvements described above would be removed, constructed, and/or reconstructed as required. All of the accessory facility work would be completed for the existing rail yards and rights-of-way.






Figure 2-15: Modifications to Platform Nos. 2 and 3, Plan View



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-17: Service and Baggage Road Modifications, Upper Level



PLATFORMS 4, 5 & 6 PLATFORM FLOOR PLAN-SOUTH

Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-18: Service and Baggage Road Modifications, Lower Level

b. Segment 2: U.S. 101 Crossing Segment

Segment 2 improvements would consist of a bridge structure over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The bridge design would utilize supports at the south end of LAUS, at the freeway median, and at the south side of U.S. 101. The span length over U.S. 101 would be approximately 150 feet (43 meters) and the width would range from approximately 45 to 70 feet (13.7 to 21.3 meters). Bridge supports may also be placed between the northbound 101 lanes and the off-ramp, and between the southbound 101 and the off-ramp, which would reduce the span lengths. Figure 2-19 shows the Segment 2 structure crossing U.S. 101.

Four run-through tracks (Tracks 3 through 6) would extend south of Union Station on the bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 and then transition to two tracks at the freeway median on an 11-degree curve. The width of the structure at the edge of LAUS would be approximately 70 feet (21 meters) to accommodate the four run-through tracks, tapering to approximately 45 feet (14 meters) as the four tracks merge into two tracks on the south side of U.S. 101. This structure would be constructed of steel deck-plate girders with side cladding composed of glass fiber reinforced concrete.


Vertical clearance of 16.5 feet (5 meters) would be provided between the bottom of the bridge structure and the top of the pavement asphalt. As described in Segment 1 above, Tracks 3 through 6 and the associated platforms would be raised at LAUS to provide the 16.5 feet (5 meters) of vertical clearance over the freeway.

c. Segment 3: Trestle Segment

Segment 3 would consist of a column-supported trestle structure that extends from the U.S. 101 bridge east and south to the BNSF yard near 1st Street. The trestle structure would begin north of Commercial Street (near Hewitt Street), extend eastward between Commercial Street and Ducommun Street (to approximately Center Street), transition southward as it crosses over the Red Line Tunnel structure and Eastside LRT maintenance lead, and descend to connect with the SCRRRA main tracks at the BNSF yard before 1st Street (north of the 1st Street Bridge). Figure 2-20 depicts the alignment of Segment 3 overlaid on an aerial photograph. As the trestle descends to grade, retaining walls housing mechanically stabilized earth would replace the columns as the trestle support structure (approximately between Jackson Street extended and 1st Street). The trestle structure would consist of PC/PS sections, DPG sections, TPG sections, and MSE sections, as described in Section 2-1.4. The exterior of the trestle sections would be clad with a glass fiber-reinforced concrete material to promote visual uniformity in material composition. This segment includes relocation of existing utilities along the trestle alignment, as well as realignment of MTA and BNSF tracks near the trestle touch-down point.

d. Segment 4: Mail Service Segment

Segment 4 improvements would consist of a new Amtrak Mail Transfer Facility located on Amtrak property just north of Washington Boulevard and east of 16th Street. The new Amtrak Mail Transfer Facility would be approximately 250 feet (76 meters) long and 30 feet (9 meters) wide, located adjacent to and east of an existing railroad spur. In addition, a parking area and access road from Washington Boulevard would provide employee and truck access to the east side of the new facility. Figure 2-21 displays the approximate location of the new facility.



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-20: Segment 2 of Alternative A



Source: Imagecat, Inc., June 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-21: Segment 3 of Alternative A

2-2.2.2 Traffic Management Program

As part of the proposed project, a Traffic Management Program (TMP) would be developed during the final design phase to define how construction-period traffic would be operated to minimize impacts. The TMP would address any necessary detours and lanes closures on U.S. 101 or city streets, changes to pedestrian or vehicular access, haul routes for materials to and from work sites, and temporary parking restrictions. In addition, the TMP would address how property owners and the public would be notified of changes in traffic flow, or changes in access to properties, as well as contact means for questions or problems. The TMP would be developed in consultation with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation and the Department.

2-2.3 Alternative A-1


Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

The run-through tracks under Alternative A-1 would extend south from Union Station on a long elevated structure. Leaving the station platform area, the elevated structure would cross the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 and turn eastward on an alignment situated between U.S. 101 and Commercial, and then turn south again to cross over the MTA Red Line and north end of the BNSF yard. The elevated structure would finally descend to a connection with the SCRRA main tracks before 1st Street. The overall alignment is similar to Alternative A, except that the east-west portion of the alignment is north of Commercial Street instead of south.

The run-through tracks extension would involve construction of a railroad bridge span over the El Monte Busway and U.S.101. Unlike the bridge over U.S. 101 under Alternative A, which would accommodate the transition from four tracks to two tracks on the structure, Alternative A-1 would include a bridge over U.S. 101 that uniformly accommodates four run-through tracks. In doing this, the bridge structure over U.S. 101 would be able to be designed with greater curvature, which in turn allows the east-west alignment to be shifted northward (compared to Alternative A).

After crossing U.S. 101, the four tracks would transition to two, and the trestle would extend east along the north side of Commercial Street, then turn south so that the tracks would descend to grade and reconnect to the existing SCRRA mainline tracks (north of 1st Street) along the west bank of Los Angeles River. Figure 2-23 shows the overall alignment of Alternative A-1 overland in an aerial photograph.

Alternative A-1 differs from Alternative A primarily in the curvature of the bridge crossing over U.S. 101 and in the location of the east-west structure south of U.S. 101.



Source: © 2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; HDR, Inc., 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-22: Location of New Mail Facility



Source: Imagecat, Inc., June 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-23: Overall Alignment of Alternative A-1

SCRRA and Amtrak executed an agreement on September 11, 2000, stating that maintenance of the run-through tracks would be shared between SCRRA and Amtrak based upon usage of the tracks.

2-2.3.1 Physical Components

Alternative A-1 has four distinct segments that extend from north to south. Segment 1 represents the physical changes that would occur at LAUS. Segment 2 is the crossing of the run-through tracks over U.S. 101. Segment 3 would be the trestle structure that extends east and south from the U.S. 101 to the SCRRA tracks at the BNSF yard. Segment 4 would be the new Mail Facility.

a. Segment 1: Union Station Segment

Segment 1 under Alternative A-1 would be the same as for Segment 1 under Alternative A.

b. Segment 2: U.S. 101 Crossing Segment

Segment 2 improvements would consist of a bridge structure over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The bridge design would utilize supports at the south end of LAUS, the freeway median, and the south side of U.S. 101. The span length over U.S. 101 would be approximately 150 feet (43 meters) and the width would be approximately 70 feet (21 meters). Bridge supports may also be placed between the northbound 101 lanes and the off-ramp, and between the southbound 101 and the off-ramp; these supports would reduce the span lengths needed to cross the roadways. Figure 2-23 shows the Segment 2 structure crossing the U.S. 101.

Four run-through tracks (Tracks 3 through 6) would extend south from Union Station on the bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. Near the south side of U.S.101, the four tracks would begin transitioning to two. The width of the U.S. 101 crossing would be approximately 70 feet (21 meters) to accommodate the four run-through tracks. This structure would be constructed of steel deck-plate girders with side cladding composed of glass fiber reinforced concrete. Vertical clearance of 16.5 feet (5 meters) would be provided between the bottom of the bridge structure and the top of paving. As described in Segment 1 above, Tracks 3 through 6 and the associated platforms would be raised at LAUS to provide the necessary vertical clearance over the freeway.

c. Segment 3: Trestle Segment

Segment 3 would consist of a column-supported trestle structure that extends from the U.S. 101 bridge east and south to the BNSF yard near 1st Street and accommodate two tracks (see Figure 2-24). The trestle structure would extend from the U.S. 101 crossing (at approximately Garey Street) eastward between the freeway and Commercial Street to approximately Center Street, transition southward as it crosses over the Red Line Tunnel structure and Eastside LRT maintenance lead, and descend to connect with the SCRRA main tracks (north of the 1st Street Bridge). Figure 2-25 depicts the alignment of Segment 3 in the vicinity of the MTA Red Line Tunnel Portal. The trestle structure would consist of PC/PS sections, DPG sections, TPG sections, and MSE sections, as described in Section 2-1.4 .





Figure 2-24: Segment 2 of Alternative A-1



Source: Imagecat, Inc., June 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-25: Segment 3 of Alternative A-1



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 2-26: MTA Portal

As the trestle descends to grade, retaining walls housing mechanically stabilized earth would replace the columns as the trestle support structure (approximately between Jackson Street extended and 1st Street). The exterior of the trestle sections would be clad with a glass fiber reinforced concrete material to promote visual uniformity in material composition.

This segment would also include the relocation of existing utilities along the trestle alignment, as well as realignment of MTA and BNSF tracks near the trestle touch-down point..

d. Segment 4: Mail Service Segment

Segment 4 improvements under Alternative A-1 would be the same as for Alternative A described above.

2-2.3.2 Traffic Management Program

As part of the proposed project, a TMP would be developed during final design. The components of the TMP for Alternative A-1 would be the same as described in section 2-2.2.2 for Alternative A.

2-3 RELATED PROJECTS THAT AFFECT THE PROPOSED RUN-THROUGH TRACKS PROJECT

There are several transportation projects in the vicinity of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project that would influence its design. Coordination with these projects is necessary to avoid or reduce conflict with their individual purposes and to avoid or reduce the need for future modifications.

2-3.1 MTA Eastside LRT Project

The Pasadena Gold Line now terminates at the old LAUS Tracks 1 and 2. Construction for the Eastside LRT extension project, which begins in Fall 2003, will extend the Gold Line across the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 on an elevated structure. The line will remain elevated as it crosses Commercial Street, and then turn westward to Alameda Street. The elevated line will run parallel to the east right-of-way line of Alameda Street before returning to grade before 1st Street. The line then turns east and runs at-grade down the center of 1st Street crossing the Los Angeles River on the historic 1st Street Bridge. A station is to be built on 1st Street near Alameda Street.

A maintenance lead begins at the intersection of Alameda and Ducommun Streets, transitioning from elevated to at-grade along Ducommun Street. The maintenance lead then turns south to connect to a new LRT maintenance facility located in the existing MTA Red Line Maintenance Facility. The MTA maintenance yard is located adjacent (west of) the BNSF West Bank Yard, between 1st and 4th Streets. Passengers will not travel over the maintenance lead; it is used to move trains between the maintenance facility and the main line on Alameda.

The MTA Red Line subway tunnel that passes under LAUS returns to the surface on the south side of U.S. 101, in the block bounded by Commercial, Center, and Ducommun Streets and the BNSF main line. The subway portal is located near Ducommun Street, and tracks lead from that location to the MTA maintenance facility south of 1st Street. The subway portal is a critical point in determining potential alignments for various rail improvements in the area. It would be impractical to relocate the portal to another site, due to the extremely high cost to construct a new tunnel and the critical need to maintain a connection to the MTA maintenance facility for all Red Line trains. Accordingly, the design of the Run-Through Tracks Project is predicated on avoiding impacts to the portal.

As part of the Eastside LRT project, a maintenance lead that provides a connection between the main LRT line on Alameda and the maintenance facility has been designed to travel along Ducommun Street. Construction of the maintenance line is scheduled to begin in 2003. In order for the run-through tracks alignment to avoid the portal and then transition smoothly back to grade, it is proposed that the MTA maintenance line along Ducommun be shifted off Ducommun to the east of Center Street so as to be able to cross at-grade to the west of (behind) the portal, and thence to connect to tracks leading into the MTA maintenance yard (see Figure 2-25).

2-3.2 Roadway Network Projects

The area around LAUS has a very dense roadway network ranging from major highways to local city streets. The network in the area includes the following roadway projects that could be affected by the proposed project.

2-3.2.1 U.S. 101 Freeway

Regional vehicular access to central Los Angeles is provided via the Hollywood Freeway (U.S. 101), which passes along the southern edge of Union Station. There are 12 lanes of traffic, including seven mainline lanes (4 westbound and 3 eastbound), an entrance ramp from Commercial Street, an exit ramp to Alameda Street, two bus-only lanes and one frontage street to the north. Freeway access is provided via one-way frontage roads, Aliso Street on the north side of the freeway and Commercial Street on the south side of the freeway. Ramps for the freeway are located at Mission Road, Vignes Street, Alameda Street, Los Angeles Street, Spring Street, and North Broadway. The Department has developed plans for the realignment of U.S.101 between Center Street and Los Angeles Street. The freeway and adjacent entry/exit facilities are to be reconstructed beginning in 2003. The planned improvements involve the rearrangement of the entrance and exit terminals on the south side of the freeway. A center median will be provided as part of the overall plan that will be wide enough to construct a pier for a center support for an overcrossing to carry both the Run-Through Tracks Project and MTA's Eastside Light Rail Line bridge.

2-3.2.2 Alameda Street

Alameda Street serves vehicular traffic to/from Union Station as well as visitors to the El Pueblo Multicultural Center, Chinatown, Little Tokyo and downtown Los Angeles. Alameda Street will be modified as part of the Eastside LRT project. From near the freeway, the Eastside LRT alignment will be on aerial structure above the street, descending to at-grade as it approaches 1st Street. Construction is planned to begin in 2004.

2-3.2.3 Commercial Street

Commercial Street is classified by the City of Los Angeles as a collector roadway. It is located approximately one-half block south of U.S.101 and serves as the westbound frontage road for the freeway between Alameda Street and N. Hewitt Street, where an entrance ramp to the freeway currently exists. East of Alameda Street, Commercial Street becomes a two-way roadway with one lane in each direction. The City of Los Angeles has plans for the widening of Commercial Street between Alameda Street and Center Street. The project includes widening the existing street, median modifications, and modifications of the on/off- ramp of the southbound U.S.101. No date for the work has been established.

2-3.2.4 1st Street

First Street is a major highway providing access to and from downtown Los Angeles. The street runs east-west and provides one of a limited number of crossings of the Los Angeles River in the downtown area. The 1st Street Bridge structure begins just east of Center Street. In addition to spanning the river, it spans sets of railroad mainline tracks on either side of the river. The bridge has been deemed an historic property. The City of Los Angeles plans to widen the bridge to replace traffic capacity lost to placement of the Eastside LRT tracks along the center of the bridge. The proposed work by the City project would raise the existing bridge to provide vertical clearance of 16.5 feet (5 meters) above Santa Fe Avenue and 20 feet (16 meters) widening on the north side of the bridge. The project also includes reconfiguration of street and median modification. The reconfigured bridge would pass above tracks that link to the proposed run-through tracks structure, which would begin between 75 and 150 feet (23 and 46 meters) north of the 1st Street Bridge.

2-3.3 Freight Rail System

The BNSF has freight railroad operations near LAUS, primarily in two corridors along either side of the Los Angeles River. On the west side of the river, BNSF operates on tracks owned by MTA. (Although the tracks are owned by MTA, they are referred to as the SCRRA Main Line in recognition of the service that utilizes them). BNSF also has an intermodal staging yard in the vicinity of 1st Street known as the West Bank Yard. The yard has the capacity to store trains up to 8,000 feet (2,438 meters) long on each of four tracks. Approximately 32 freight train movements occur in the vicinity of Union Station. While freight trains do not enter Union Station itself, their operations affect many passenger trains that enter and exit LAUS via the LAUS throat since the BNSF freight operations pass by the entry to the throat at Mission Tower.

The rail corridor on the west side of the Los Angeles River is constrained by the river on the east and Santa Fe Avenue on the west. The corridor accommodates main line tracks, the BNSF West

Bank Yard and MTA maintenance yard and facilities. At the widest point, there are 26 tracks. Access to these yards and facilities involves an extensive network of switches. The Run-Through Tracks Project would interface with this complicated track network, and thus must respond to required clearances between parallel tracks, desirable distances between switches, trains moving at various speeds and for different purposes, and a host of other factors.

2-3.4 El Monte Busway Extension Project

A Feasibility Study and Project Study Report was recently funded by Catellus (the owner of the Union Station campus) and MTA to investigate an HOV connection across U.S. 101 between El Monte Busway/Union Station and the Alameda Street corridor. Although this project is currently not on any state or local transportation plans, potential conflicts between the Run-Through Tracks Project and this project were investigated and identified as part of the Alternatives Analysis phase. Current design for the Run-Through Tracks Project does not preclude the extension project from occurring in the future.

2-3.5 High Speed Rail Project

The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has proposed to construct and operate a high-speed train system providing high-speed train (HST) service for intercity travel in California between the major metropolitan centers of the San Francisco Bay area and Sacramento in the north, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. The FRA is the lead Federal agency in the preparation of a combined Programmatic Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (Program EIR/EIS). The Draft Program EIR/EIS was released in January 2004, and the public comment period ends closed August 31, 2004.

LAUS would be an essential terminal station for the HST high-speed train system. The authority has identified the existing LAUS as the preferred HST station location to serve Los Angeles. The HST station would be an elevated structure over the current tracks and platforms and would pass over the run-through tracks U.S. 101 bridge. The Final Program EIR/EIS is being prepared. Three different configurations using new tracks and platforms are—were considered in the published Draft Program EIR/EIS. The high-speed trains are not anticipated to use the existing tracks and platforms nor the proposed Run-Through Tracks improvements, although shared use concepts could be explored in the future. Detailed configuration of the high-speed train—HST tracks and station facilities at LAUS would be evaluated in future project studies and environmental documentation prepared by the CHSRA.

The Department evaluated the high-speed train track alignment and station configuration options for potential conflicts and found that the Run-Through Tracks Project would not conflict with the proposed high-speed train system alignments and station options, assuming that the latter would either be built as proposed above the current rails and platforms at LAUS, or would be built near to LAUS (such as proposed station location along the Los Angeles River) with linkage provided between the stations. The Run-Through Tracks Project alternatives do not preclude any of the high-speed train options.

2-3.6 MAGLEV Project

The Southern California Association of Governments is exploring the use of high-speed magnetic levitation technology (Maglev) as an option for regional transportation in Southern California. Maglev is incompatible with other train technologies and would operate on a separate guideway and serve separate platforms. ~~The first~~ One Maglev route, should the concept be advanced, is intended to pass through LAUS. The Department evaluated the Maglev concept and the proposed California high-speed rail program for potential conflicts and found that the Maglev plan assumed very high-level platforms above the LAUS platforms and potential elevated high-speed rail platforms, which would not conflict with the proposed the Run-Through Tracks Project alternatives. The Run-Through Tracks Project alternatives do not preclude future consideration of Maglev or high-speed rail in the vicinity of LAUS.

2-3.7 Development Projects

In addition to the transportation projects listed above, there are numerous development projects that could occur within about 1 mile of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project. These proposed projects range from redevelopment of individual parcels to large-scale developments. Appendix K includes a table listing 90 projects in the vicinity. These projects have been considered in the traffic analysis and in the discussion of cumulative impacts. Impact assessments have considered all or a portion of this project list, as appropriate for each impact section.

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE AND NEED

1-1 SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would address three basic needs identified in the discussion below of transportation conditions, problems, and issues:

- Improve operational efficiencies and scheduling reliability for trains using Union Station by reducing the constraint on train movements that results from stub-end operation. Current design of the station requires that all trains must enter and exit through the same set of lead tracks to connect to the main lines and are thus subject to delays either at the station platforms or on the connecting lead tracks while awaiting a slot at the platforms or access onto the main lines.
- Improve pedestrian access and functionality of the passenger platforms while also improving connectivity with other transit services. Pedestrian movements through Union Station are forecasted by MTA to increase from the current 40,000 persons per weekday to about 60,000 persons daily over the next decade. Improvements to railroad platforms would bring those at Union Station that have not been previously renovated into ADA compliance. Converting Platforms 7 and 8 back to utilization for passengers in order to maintain existing levels of service during reconstruction of Platforms 2 and 3 would provide a long-term increase in platform capacity at the station. The increase in platform capacity would serve forecasted growth to 2025 and beyond.
- Increase the capacity of Union Station to accommodate planned growth of Amtrak and SCRRA train services. The number of trains using the station is forecasted to grow from 159 today to 223 by 2010 and 276 by 2025. Initial analysis indicated that acceptable levels of service reliability could be provided by the current facilities only through about 2010. After that date, as more trains are added, scheduling reliability would begin to deteriorate, especially during peak hours.

1-2 TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS, PROBLEMS, ISSUES AND NEEDS

The Union Station Passenger Terminal was constructed in 1939 to serve as the Los Angeles terminus for transcontinental passenger trains before interstate highways and international airports were established. Access to Union Station is not provided directly via mainline tracks but rather via a set of lead tracks. The current operation of the station requires trains to pull into the terminal and then reverse their direction of travel after unloading or loading passengers. Many passengers transfer to other trains or other local transportation modes, leaving the station to reach their final destinations. Since all trains, whether starting/ending their trips or continuing beyond the station, must enter and exit through the same set of lead tracks to connect to the main line, they are subject to delays either at the station platforms or on the connecting tracks while waiting for slots at the platforms or for access back onto the main lines (Figure 1-1, 1-2 and 1-3.) Due to the current “stub-end” configuration of terminal tracks, all trains must leave LAUS in reverse direction, causing

significant service delays and increased run times for intercity and commuter rail passenger service. The current one-way in-and-out configuration also limits the ultimate capacity of the station.

While the station still services the few remaining Amtrak cross-country passenger trains serving southern California, it currently functions more importantly as a regional intermodal rail hub and transfer point. The station is heavily used by the State of California-sponsored intercity *Pacific Surfliner* trains between San Luis Obispo and San Diego, as well as by the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) Metrolink commuter trains.

Based on projected growth in regional passenger rail demand, this “stub-end” station configuration has been identified as a major constraint to providing increased service levels and reliability to meet the forecasted growth in intercity and regional train traffic.

1-2.1 Union Station

1-2.1.1 Existing Operating Conditions

As the focal point of passenger rail travel in Southern California, LAUS serves an average 159 revenue passenger trains each weekday, consisting of 126 SCRRA¹ intracity commuter trains (Metrolink), 25 Amtrak *Pacific Surfliner* service trains, and eight Amtrak long-haul intercity trains. The long-haul trains (*Coast Starlight*, from Seattle; *Southwest Chief*, from Chicago; and *Sunset Limited*, from Orlando) end their interstate trips in Los Angeles and begin their return trips from there. In addition, there are numerous non-revenue train movements required in the LAUS terminal in order to service passenger train equipment and to position the equipment at the station platforms for revenue service.

Railroad passengers arriving at Union Station can transfer to two transit modes: subway/light rail and buses. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) operates a subway system approximately 12 meters (40 feet) below ground level at Union Station. There are currently approximately 280 scheduled Metro Red Line movements daily at Union Station. The subway runs through the downtown area and then westward to as far west as the mid-Wilshire area, with a branch to North Hollywood. The subway provides a connection to MTA’s Blue Line light rail transit (LRT) service, which begins in a subway in the southern part of downtown Los Angeles and then transitions to street-level service to Long Beach. The MTA opened the Pasadena Gold Line LRT project in summer 2003.

The Pasadena Gold Line terminates at the old Union Station Tracks 1 and 2, just south of Union Station Platform 2. The Gold Line includes a new platform that matches the floor height of LRT vehicles. MTA is planning an extension of the LRT service to East Los Angeles that would begin at the new LRT platform, pass over U.S. 101, and then transition to an at-grade alignment on Alameda Street. It should be noted that the Eastside LRT bridge over U.S. 101 is not designed to accommodate the weight of Metrolink and Amtrak trains.

¹ Source: SCRRA, Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service, June 24, 2002. (This number excludes Inland Empire-Orange County trains, which do not pass through Union Station).



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 1-1: Union Station Vicinity Aerial Overview



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 1-2: Mission Junction Aerial Overview



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 1-3: Union Station Tracks and Throat Area

Union Station is connected to the Patsouras Transit Center bus facility at the adjoining MTA headquarters building. The Transit Center serves regional bus routes operated by:

- Antelope Valley Transit (1 route)
- City of Los Angeles Commuter Express (1 route)
- Foothill Transit (10 routes)
- Gardena Municipal Bus Line (1 route)
- Montebello Municipal Bus Lines (5 routes)
- MTA (12 routes)
- Santa Clarita Transit (1 route)
- Santa Monica Municipal Bus Lines (Big Blue Bus) (1 route)
- Torrance Transit (2 routes).

In addition, Union Station and the Patsouras Transit Center are served by two local shuttle routes (LA DASH) operated by the City of Los Angeles. Amtrak bus service, which provides linkage to the Amtrak line in California's Central Valley (Bakersfield), operates from Union Station. Rental car service and taxis are also available at Union Station.

MTA estimates³ that about 40,000 persons per weekday make use of the Union Station complex. Within the next decade, MTA estimates that the opening of the Gold Line extension to Claremont and the LRT line to East Los Angeles would add another 20,000 daily riders.

1-2.1.2 Forecasted Growth in Train Traffic

a. Amtrak

Amtrak service on the *Pacific Surfliner* is subsidized by the California Department of Transportation (Department). The State Rail Plan⁴ incorporates the results of Amtrak's 20-year improvement program⁵ for California. The State Rail Plan includes several objectives for the 2001–2011 period that affect Union Station:

- Increase annual ridership by 52 percent, from 1,662,000 to 2,518,000

² Source: SCRRA, Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service, June 24, 2002. (This number excludes Inland Empire-Orange County trains, which do not pass through Union Station).

³ Los Angeles Times, May 22, 2003.

⁴ California State Rail Plan, 2001–02 to 2010–11, January 2002, California Department of Transportation.

⁵ California Passenger Rail System, 20-year Improvement Plan, March 2001, Amtrak.

- Increase the frequency of daily round-trip service, from 11 to 16 trains between Los Angeles and San Diego, from 4 to 6 between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara/Goleta, and from 1 to 2 trains extended beyond Goleta to San Luis Obispo
- Reduce train running times to less than 2 hours between Los Angeles and San Diego, 2 hours between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara/Goleta, and 2 hours between Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo
- Improve the reliability (on-time performance) of trains.

The proposed expansion of the *Pacific Surfliner* service is as follows:

- 2003–04 Los Angeles—twelfth and thirteenth round-trips to San Diego, plus two round-trips from Los Angeles to Santa Barbara, and one round-trip from Santa Barbara to San Luis Obispo
- 2005–06 Los Angeles—fourteenth round-trip to San Diego
- 2006–07 Los Angeles—fifteenth round-trip to San Diego
- 2008–09 Los Angeles—sixteenth round-trip to San Diego

b. Metrolink

SCRRA has begun a systemwide planning effort to address long-term commuter needs. That planning is still in progress; therefore official forecasts for service in 2010 and 2025 are not available. Working estimates⁶ indicate that about 56 commuter trains would be added by 2010 (for a total of 182) and that about another 53 would be added between 2010 and 2025. In addition to adding new trains, SCRRA would increase capacity on existing trains by adding more cars. SCRRA has undertaken a program of station improvements throughout its system to enable extension of train consists (combinations) from three to ~~four~~ eight cars. Working forecasts from SCRRA indicate that ridership through Union Station would reach about 37,000 passengers by 2010 and more than 60,000 passengers by 2025.

It should be noted that the addition of Amtrak trains would occur primarily in the midday period, while most SCRRA growth would occur in the morning and evening peak commuter periods. Some SCRRA growth would also occur during the midday period.

1-2.2 Constraints on Union Station Operations

The function of LAUS as a transit hub has implications in several key areas:

- Track capacity and configuration to handle the movement of passenger trains

⁶ Source: SCRRA, Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service, June 24, 2002.

- Platform capacity to handle loading and unloading of train passengers, especially during peak periods
- Pedestrian capacity in the tunnel that connects the platforms and provides the main access to the Red Line subway and the Patsouras Transit Center bus facility
- Ramp capacity and configuration for the movements between the pedestrian tunnel and the train platforms
- Accessibility provisions for disabled passengers
- Ancillary activities necessary for the trains to function (baggage service, maintenance service, etc.)

Information about these topics, issues/problems associated with their current functionality, and needs that should be addressed by any proposed improvements are provided below.

a. Tracks

Description

LAUS includes 10 active stub-ended passenger tracks that serve Amtrak and Metrolink trains. These are Tracks 3 through 12 (see Figure 1-4). There is an escape track located between Tracks 7 and 8. The 10 tracks are connected to 4 lead tracks (Track Leads 2 through 5) through a series of switches. The lead tracks provide access into and out of the station, southward from Mission Junction, off the various mainline tracks. The area between Mission Junction and the platforms is referred to as the “throat” of Union Station.


Tracks 1 and 2 are new tracks used by the Gold Line LRT service. Track 13 is used for mail operations. Tracks 14 through 16 previously existed but were removed to create parking for the mail facility and for construction of the MTA headquarters.

Issues

Although 10 tracks would appear to provide a substantial amount of capacity, that perception must be informed by two factors: (1) the reduction in efficiency that arises from arriving and departing trains having to move through the throat and then connecting to the various main lines and (2) the need for many train movements to occur within the peak periods of commuter rail passenger activities (the beginning and end of the business day).

Needs

Analysis conducted for this study indicates that the current track configuration can handle forecasted volumes of train traffic while concurrently providing acceptable levels of service reliability only through about 2010. After that date, as more and more trains are attempt to use



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 1-4: Track Layout

the station, scheduling reliability would begin to deteriorate, especially during peak hours. This deterioration would arise and increase as the additional trains attempt to move into and out of Union Station within constrained time periods. If trains were delayed, their planned “slots” for arrival/unloading/loading/departure could be lost, which could interfere with the slots of other trains. Fewer opportunities for schedule recovery would become available when the overall capacity of Union Station is approached. To provide reliable schedules for train service and sufficient recovery opportunities, a better way to move trains in and out of the station is needed.

b. Platforms and Tunnel

Description

The 10 passenger tracks are served by 5 railroad platforms (Platforms 2 through 6) that serve Amtrak and Metrolink passenger trains. Each railroad platform is 6.3 meters (20 feet, 9 inches) wide and is located at surface level. Platform 2 is the westernmost railroad platform, servicing Tracks 3 and 4. Platform 2 is approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) long and is the shortest platform of the five railroad platforms within the Union Station complex. Platform 6 is the easternmost passenger platform, servicing Tracks 11 and 12. Platform 6 is approximately 457 meters (1,500 feet) long and is the longest railroad platform. All stub-ended Amtrak and Metrolink railroad tracks are at about the same height with respect to the top-of-rail elevations. The Gold Line is served by a separate platform (Platform 1) that matches the floor height of LRT vehicles. There is also a baggage-handling access road at the south end of the station and a pedestrian tunnel under the station tracks.

The 8.5-meter (28-foot)-wide pedestrian tunnel provides access between the boarding/alighting platforms and the main public areas of Union Station (ticketing, waiting rooms, etc.). The tunnel traverses one level below the surface tracks and platforms. There are two ramps connecting to each of the five railroad platforms, as well as ~~two ramps~~ one stairwell and one elevator connecting to the Gold Line Platform 1; ~~there are no ramps to Platform 1~~. The ramps run at right angles to the pedestrian tunnel in a north-south direction. The south ramps have been changed to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; ~~some~~ none of the north ramps have been changed ~~and some have not~~.

Union Station previously included Platforms 7 and 8, but these were removed to create parking for the mail facility and for construction of the MTA headquarters.

Issues

The capacity of the platforms, connecting ramps, and pedestrian tunnel to serve railroad passengers must be considered concurrently with concepts to improve track configurations. The role of these Union Station resources in connecting to LRT, subway, and bus transit services adjacent to the station must be included. Designs would need to account for the movement of pedestrians through confined locations (i.e., the ramps), provide sufficient room for queuing and baggage handling on the platforms, and allow simultaneous loading and unloading of passengers on the platforms. These designs would also need to account for increasing numbers of users and changes to comply with the ADA, recognizing that Union Station is a National Register-listed historic resource. Some of the physical components of Union Station are considered to be part of

its “historic fabric,” and changes to those components as part of a federal undertaking are subject to review and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), under the authority and requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act. It should be noted, however, that track work is usually not considered to be historic fabric since it has typically been replaced or modified as a result of ongoing rail operations over time.

The proposed construction of the run-through tracks would require a change in elevation of those platforms that would be served by the run-through facility. This would be necessary to achieve an increase in the height of the rail structure in order to pass over U.S. 101 with sufficient vertical clearance. Because Platforms 2 through 6 are needed to provide sufficient passenger access for the current level of service, in order to avoid impacts on that service, new platforms would need to be built before those platforms that require elevation changes are removed from service. The only area available for the replacement platforms is the location now used for mail operations. By rebuilding the previous Platforms 7 and 8, along with Tracks 13 through 16, the passenger and train capacities of Union Station would be retained while the run-through platforms (Platforms 2 and 3) and tracks (Tracks 3 through 6) are changed.

Needs

The platforms, ramps, and central pedestrian tunnel need to be changed in order to provide sufficient capacity to handle forecasted growth. Increasing numbers of railroad passengers would use these facilities as a result of increased train service at Union Station. In addition, additional passengers using MTA bus, subway, and light rail facilities who transfer to or from railroad trains would need to be accommodated.

c. Ancillary activities

Description

Union Station currently includes a mail handling facility on its eastern edge. Mail is transferred between trains and tractor-trailers that move mail to and from local postal facilities. This transfer operation uses the spaces formerly occupied by Platforms 7 and 8 and Tracks 14 through 16. Track 13 provides the rail service for the mail handling function. The track can accommodate nine railroad cars and is in operation around the clock, 7 days a week. Peak activities occur in mornings and late afternoons. The mail trailers come directly to the site from several postal locations, with express mail trailers coming from a storage lot that is part of the Amtrak facilities at Redondo Junction near 16th Street. Between 6 a.m. and 8 a.m., mail is transferred from inbound railroad boxcars to the trailers, with the reverse occurring at the end of the business day. Transfers from trailers to outbound trains usually begin between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. The loaded rail cars are released for movement at 6:20 p.m. Empty trailers are moved off the site between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. and are returned to the Redondo Junction site.

In September 2004, Amtrak announced that it intended to exit the mail and express business in order to concentrate on its core business of transporting passengers. As a result, the issue of whether Amtrak would need to build a new Amtrak Mail Transfer Facility at Redondo Junction as a result of the elimination of the existing Mail Facility along the northeastern side of the LAUS to accommodate new platforms is unclear at this time. In the interest of full disclosure,

the Final EIR/EIS retains the discussions and analysis of the impacts of the construction of a new facility should a decision be made in the future that a new facility at Redondo Junction is necessary or appropriate.

Issues

Platforms 7 and 8, which now accommodate mail operations, would provide the opportunity for replacement pedestrian access to trains before Platforms 2 and 3 are raised, so there would be no loss of train service or pedestrian capacity during construction. No other locations within the Union Station facility have been identified by Amtrak as suitable for handling the mail transfer function.

Needs

As noted above, the space now used on Platforms 7 and 8 for mail operations is needed in order to provide replacement pedestrian access to trains before Platforms 2 and 3 are raised so that there is no lessening of train service during construction. Previous planning by Amtrak identified a suitable location for the transfers to occur within Amtrak's Redondo Junction property.

1-3 RELATED PROJECTS THAT AFFECT THE PROPOSED RUN-THROUGH TRACKS PROJECT

Several transportation projects in the vicinity of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would influence its design. Coordination with these projects is necessary to avoid or reduce conflict with their individual purposes and to avoid or reduce the need for future modifications.

1-3.1 MTA Eastside LRT Project

The Pasadena Gold Line now terminates at the old LAUS Tracks 1 and 2. Construction for the Eastside LRT extension project, which began in Fall 2003, will extend the Gold Line across the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 on an elevated structure. The line will remain elevated as it crosses Commercial Street, and then turn westward to Alameda Street. The elevated line will run parallel to the east right-of-way line of Alameda Street before returning to grade before 1st Street. The line then turns east and runs at-grade down the center of 1st Street crossing the Los Angeles River on the historic 1st Street Bridge. A station is to be built on 1st Street near Alameda Street.

A maintenance lead begins at the intersection of Alameda and Ducommun Streets, transitioning from elevated to at-grade along Ducommun Street. The maintenance lead then turns south to connect to a new LRT maintenance facility located in the existing MTA Red Line Maintenance Facility. The MTA maintenance yard is located adjacent (west of) the BNSF West Bank Yard, between 1st and 4th Streets. Passengers will not travel over the maintenance lead; it is used to move trains between the maintenance facility and the main line on Alameda.

The MTA Red Line subway tunnel that passes under LAUS returns to the surface on the south side of U.S. 101, in the block bounded by Commercial, Center, and Ducommun Streets and the BNSF main line. The subway portal is located near Ducommun Street, and tracks lead from that location to the MTA maintenance facility south of 1st Street. The subway portal is a critical point in determining potential alignments for various rail improvements in the area. It would be impractical to relocate the portal to another site, due to the extremely high cost to construct a new tunnel and the critical need to maintain a connection to the MTA maintenance facility for all Red Line trains. Accordingly, the design of the Run-Through Tracks Project is predicated on avoiding impacts to the portal.

As part of the Eastside LRT project, a maintenance lead that provides a connection between the main LRT line on Alameda and the maintenance facility has been designed to travel along Ducommun Street. Construction of the maintenance line is scheduled to begin in 2003. In order for the run-through tracks alignment to avoid the portal and then transition smoothly back to grade, it is proposed that the MTA maintenance line along Ducommun be shifted off Ducommun to the east of Center Street so as to be able to cross at-grade to the west of (behind) the portal, and thence to connect to tracks leading into the MTA maintenance yard.

1-3.2 Roadway Network Projects

The area around LAUS has a very dense roadway network ranging from major highways to local city streets. The network in the area includes the following roadway projects that could be affected by the proposed project.

1-3.2.1 U.S. 101 Freeway

Regional vehicular access to central Los Angeles is provided via the Hollywood Freeway (U.S. 101), which passes along the southern edge of Union Station. There are 12 lanes of traffic, including seven mainline lanes (4 westbound and 3 eastbound), an entrance ramp from Commercial Street, an exit ramp to Alameda Street, two bus-only lanes and one frontage street to the north. Freeway access is provided via one-way frontage roads, Aliso Street on the north side of the freeway and Commercial Street on the south side of the freeway. Ramps for the freeway are located at Mission Road, Vignes Street, Alameda Street, Los Angeles Street, Spring Street, and North Broadway. The California Department of Transportation has developed plans for the realignment of U.S. 101 between Center Street and Los Angeles Street. The freeway and adjacent entry/exit facilities are to be reconstructed beginning in 2003. The planned improvements involve the rearrangement of the entrance and exit terminals on the south side of the freeway. A center median will be provided as part of the overall plan that will be wide enough to construct a pier for a center support for an overcrossing to carry both the Run-Through Tracks Project and MTA's Eastside Light Rail Line bridge.

1-3.2.2 Alameda Street

Alameda Street serves vehicular traffic to/from Union Station as well as visitors to the El Pueblo Multicultural Center, Chinatown, Little Tokyo and downtown Los Angeles. Alameda Street will be modified as part of the Eastside LRT project. From near the freeway, the Eastside LRT

alignment will be on aerial structure above the street, descending to at-grade as it approaches 1st Street. Construction is planned to begin in 2003.

1-3.2.3 Commercial Street

Commercial Street is classified by the City of Los Angeles as a collector roadway. It is located approximately one-half block south of U.S.101 and serves as the westbound frontage road for the freeway between Alameda Street and N. Hewitt Street, where an entrance ramp to the freeway currently exists. East of Alameda Street, Commercial Street becomes a two-way roadway with one lane in each direction. The City of Los Angeles has plans for the widening of Commercial Street between Alameda Street and Center Street. The project includes widening the existing street, median modifications, and modifications of the on/off- ramp of the southbound U.S.101. No date for the work has been established.

1-3.2.4 1st Street

First Street is a major highway providing access to and from downtown Los Angeles. The street runs east-west and provides one of a limited number of crossings of the Los Angeles River in the downtown area. The 1st Street Bridge structure begins just east of Center Street. In addition to spanning the river, it spans sets of railroad mainline tracks on either side of the river. The bridge has been deemed an historic property. The City of Los Angeles plans to widen the bridge to replace traffic capacity lost to placement of the Eastside LRT tracks along the center of the bridge. The proposed work by the City project would raise the existing bridge to provide vertical clearance of 16.5 feet (5 meters) above Santa Fe Avenue and 20 feet (16 meters) widening on the north side of the bridge. The project also includes reconfiguration of street and median modification. The reconfigured bridge would pass above tracks that link to the proposed run-through tracks structure, which would begin between 75 and 150 feet (23 and 46 meters) north of the 1st Street Bridge.

The City of Los Angeles prepared an Environmental Impact Report for the widening of the 1st Street Bridge and 1st Street between Mission Road and Clarence Street. The Draft EIR was completed in 2004, and the Final EIR is expected to be completed in late 2005. The bridge deck would be widened by approximately 26 feet (ft) to the north to accommodate construction and operation of the Eastside LRT's dual tracks along the bridge's median. Widening to the north would also occur along 1st Street east of Mission Road to Clarence Street and from a northerly extension of South Garey Street to Vignes Street to match the realigned westbound lanes of the widened bridge. The project also includes improvement of the Vignes Street and Mission Road intersections for LRT and vehicular transition; replacement of bridge railings, approach guardrails, and transition guardrails; and an approximately 30-foot extension of the existing pier and debris nose in the low-flow channel of the Los Angeles River. The project would also correct various horizontal and vertical clearance deficiencies, which include realigning Santa Fe Avenue and Myers Street and correction of vertical and horizontal clearance deficiencies at the Santa Fe Avenue and Myers Street under crossings.

Design of the 1st Bridge modifications has been coordinated to allow for the modified alignment of tracks that would pass under the bridge as a result of the Run-Through Tracks Project.

1-3.3 Freight Rail System

The BNSF has freight railroad operations near LAUS, primarily in two corridors along either side of the Los Angeles River. On the west side of the river, BNSF operates on tracks owned by MTA. (Although the tracks are owned by MTA, they are referred to as the SCRRA Main Line ~~or Metrolink tracks~~ in recognition of the service that utilizes them.) BNSF also has an intermodal staging yard in the vicinity of 1st Street known as the West Bank Yard. The yard has the capacity to store trains up to 8,000 feet (2,438 meters) long on each of four tracks. Approximately 32 freight train movements occur in the vicinity of Union Station. While freight trains do not enter Union Station itself, their operations affect many passenger trains that enter and exit LAUS via the LAUS throat since the BNSF freight operations pass by the entry to the throat at Mission Tower.

The rail corridor on the west side of the Los Angeles River is constrained by the river on the east and Santa Fe Avenue on the west. The corridor accommodates main line tracks, the BNSF West Bank Yard and MTA maintenance yard and facilities. At the widest point, there are 26 tracks. Access to these yards and facilities involves an extensive network of switches. The Run-Through Tracks Project would interface with this complicated track network, and thus must respond to required clearances between parallel tracks, desirable distances between switches, trains moving at various speeds and for different purposes, and a host of other factors.

1-3.4 El Monte Busway Extension Project

A Feasibility Study and Project Study Report was recently funded by Catellus (the owner of the Union Station campus) and MTA to investigate an HOV connection across U.S. 101 between El Monte Busway/Union Station and the Alameda Street corridor. Although this project is currently not on any state or local transportation plans, potential conflicts between the Run-Through Tracks Project and this project were investigated and identified as part of the Alternatives Analysis phase. Current design for the Run-Through Tracks Project does not preclude the extension project from occurring in the future.

1-3.5 High Speed Rail Project

The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has proposed to construct and operate a high-speed train system providing high-speed train (HST) service for intercity travel in California between the major metropolitan centers of the San Francisco Bay area and Sacramento in the north, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. The FRA is the lead Federal agency in the preparation of a combined Programmatic Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (Program EIR/EIS). The Draft Program EIR/EIS was released in January 2004, and the public comment period ~~ends~~ closed August 31, 2004.

LAUS would be an essential terminal station for the HST high-speed train system. The authority has identified the existing LAUS as the preferred HST station location to serve Los Angeles. The HST station would be an elevated structure over the current tracks and platforms and would pass over the run-through tracks U.S. 101 bridge. The Final Program EIR/EIS is being prepared. Three different configurations using new tracks and platforms ~~are~~ were considered in the

published Draft Program EIR/EIS. The high-speed trains are not anticipated to use the existing tracks and platforms nor the proposed Run-Through Tracks improvements, although shared use concepts could be explored in the future. Detailed configuration of the ~~high-speed train~~ HST tracks and station facilities at LAUS would be evaluated in future project studies and environmental documentation prepared by the CHSRA.

The Department evaluated the high-speed train track alignment and station configuration options for potential conflicts and found that the Run-Through Tracks Project would not conflict with the proposed high-speed train system alignments and station options, assuming that the latter would either be built as proposed above the current rails and platforms at LAUS, or would be built near to LAUS (such as proposed station location along the Los Angeles River) with linkage provided between the stations. The Run-Through Tracks Project alternatives do not preclude any of the high-speed train options.

1-3.6 MAGLEV Project

The Southern California Association of Governments is exploring the use of high-speed magnetic levitation technology (Maglev) as an option for regional transportation in Southern California. Maglev is incompatible with other train technologies and would operate on a separate guideway and serve separate platforms. ~~The first~~ One Maglev route, should the concept be advanced, is intended to pass through LAUS. The Department evaluated the Maglev concept for potential conflicts and found that the Maglev plan assumed very high-level platforms above the LAUS and HST platforms, which would not conflict with the proposed the Run-Through Tracks Project alternatives. The Run-Through Tracks Project alternatives do not preclude future consideration of Maglev in the vicinity of LAUS.

1-3.7 LOSSAN Corridor

The Department and FRA developed the LOSSAN Corridor Strategic Plan (October 2003) as a step in its ongoing Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (PEIR/PEIS) process for conventional rail improvements for the Los Angeles to San Diego (LOSSAN) Corridor. The Draft PEIR/PEIS was released August 2004, and the Final PEIR/PEIS is being prepared. That corridor is a backbone of the state's intercity rail network, as well as of the region's commuter rail service. Proposed LOSSAN Corridor improvements are designed to meet current rail transportation needs in the corridor and to support the proposed statewide high-speed train. The Strategic Plan identified improvements to the LOSSAN corridor over the short term (three years), the medium-term (4-6 years), and the long-term (7 years and beyond) following the completion of a Program-level EIR/EIS, which is scheduled for release in September 2004. The Run-Through Tracks Project is an improvement identified in the Strategic Plan as a medium-term project and would play an important role in achieving the proposed service improvements in the LOSSAN Corridor.

1-3.8 Development Projects

In addition to the transportation projects listed above, there are numerous development projects that could occur within about 1 mile of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project. These proposed projects range from redevelopment of individual parcels to large-scale developments. Appendix K

includes a table listing 90 projects in the vicinity. These projects have been considered in the traffic analysis and in the discussion of cumulative impacts. Impact assessments have considered all or a portion of this project list, as appropriate for each impact section.

1-4 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The issue of improving operations at Union Station was the subject of a Project Study Report (PSR) prepared for the California Department of Transportation (the Department) in June 2000. The PSR is a basic feasibility study to determine the initial concepts for transportation improvements and order of magnitude costs. The PSR identified run-through tracks as the basic solution to resolving the constraints of stub-end operations at LAUS. The concept of the run-through tracks would be to extend two tracks southward from Union Station on an aerial structure and provide a new connection into the ~~BNSF~~ SCRRA Main Line on the west side of the Los Angeles River. This would allow some of the trains that use the station to avoid the pull in/back out situation. The current operation of the station requires trains to pull into the terminal and then reverse their direction of travel after unloading or loading passengers. Overall, the run-through tracks structure would form an S-curve, connecting at its north/west end to track platforms at Union Station and at its south/east end to some point along the BNSF main line in the vicinity of the 1st Street Bridge.

In 2002, the Department and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) initiated conceptual engineering and environmental analysis for run-through tracks in cooperation with Amtrak. An Alternatives Analysis (AA) process was begun to develop and screen a full range of potential alignments. The particular alignment and touchdown point on the main line are the focus of key decisions to be made in the AA. Three rounds of screening occurred. In the Initial Screening stage, 48 potential alignments were identified between U.S. 101 on the north and 4th Street on the south, and to the west of Alameda Street. Using engineering and environmental screening criteria, the 48 potential alignments were reduced to 7 conceptual alignments that appeared most reasonable. These seven alignments, all located north of 1st Street, were further screened using more refined engineering and environmental criteria. Since some of the conceptual alignments were very similar, they were collapsed through a combining process, into four alternatives. A Second Screening was conducted for the four alternatives. Three of the alternative alignments were not desirable because they would entail numerous property acquisitions, including important public agency properties where relocation would be difficult, or a site with special manufacturing where relocation would be expensive. The initial result of the Second Screening was the identification of Alternative A as a good combination of high engineering values and low environmental impacts that should be assessed in detail in an environmental document. Upon reviewing the anticipated impacts for Alternative A at the end of the Second Screening, the question arose as to whether a variation(s) of that alignment could be developed that captured its benefits, while avoiding the conflicts with the planned Commercial Street widening and minimizing right-of-way impacts to businesses along the Alternative A alignment. To create an alignment that would be further north than Alternative A, it became clear that the concept of crossing the freeway with a single structure that accommodated two tracks (consolidated from four tracks adjacent to Platform Nos. 2 and 3) was constraining curvatures and grades in the vicinity of Commercial Street. A concept to carry four tracks across the freeway would allow the alignment to shift closer to U.S.101. Four variations of this concept were developed and

analyzed in a Supplemental Screening process, resulting in the identification of Alternative A-1 as the second alternative to be addressed in this environmental document. Additional information on the development and screening process is provided in Chapter 2.


1-5 STUDY AREA

Based upon a review of the transportation problems to be addressed, a study area was defined within which all physical and operational changes and alignment variations would occur. The study area includes both primary and secondary components. The primary study area includes the proposed changes to Union Station, a railroad bridge across U.S. 101, a trestle structure connecting that bridge to the BNSF main line north of the 1st Street Bridge, and changes to the BNSF West Bank Yard. The primary study area is bounded:

- On the north by Mission Junction (where the connecting tracks to Union Station now link to the BNSF main line)
- On the east by the Los Angeles River (which adjoins the east side of the railroad right-of-way of the BNSF main line)
- On the south by 4th Street (although most construction would be north of 1st Street)
- On the west by Alameda Street/North Main Street.

A secondary study has been defined for the area to which mail operations that now occur at Union Station would be relocated. The proposed relocation site is part of Amtrak's Redondo Junction facility. The secondary study area is bounded by a 0.5-mile radius around the intersection of E. 15th Street and E. 16th Street (near the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Santa Fe Avenue).

See Figure 1-5 for the boundaries of the two study areas.



Source: © GDT, Inc. and its licensors., Rel 10/2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 1-5: Study Areas

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES-1 BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles Union Station Passenger Terminal was constructed in 1939 to serve as the Los Angeles terminus for transcontinental passenger trains before the establishment of interstate highways and international airports. Access to Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) is not provided directly via main line tracks, but rather via a set of lead tracks. The current operation of the station requires trains to pull into the terminal and then reverse their direction of travel after unloading or loading passengers. Many passengers transfer to other trains or other local transportation modes, leaving the station to reach their final destinations. Since all trains, whether starting/ending their trips or continuing beyond the station, must enter and exit through the same set of lead tracks to connect to the main line, they are subject to delays either at the station platforms or on the connecting tracks while awaiting a slot at the platforms or access back onto the main lines (see Figure ES-1 and Figure ES-2).

As the focal point of passenger rail travel in Southern California, LAUS serves an average 159 revenue passenger trains each weekday. The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) operates an average of 126 intra-city commuter trains¹ (Metrolink), while Amtrak operates 25 *Pacific Surfliner* regional inter-city trains between San Luis Obispo and San Diego, and 8 long-haul inter-city trains. The long-haul trains (*Coast Starlight* from Seattle, *Southwest Chief* from Chicago, and *Sunset Limited* from Orlando) end their interstate trips in Los Angeles and begin their return trips from here. In addition to being the station for national, inter-regional, and intraregional train trips, LAUS functions as a regional intermodal rail hub and transfer point.


The demand for train travel to and from LAUS is expected to increase over the foreseeable future. The State Rail Plan² incorporates the results of Amtrak's 20-year improvement program³ for California. This plan calls for adding 14 additional *Pacific Surfliner* trips by 2010. SCRRA has begun a systemwide planning effort to address long-term commuter needs. That planning is still in progress; therefore, official forecasts for service in 2010 and 2025 are not available. Working estimates⁴ indicate that about 56 commuter trains would be added by 2010, and that about another 53 would be added between 2010 and 2025. Based on projected growth in regional passenger rail demand, this "stub-end" station configuration has been identified as a

¹ Source: SCRRA, Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service, 6/24/02. (This number excludes Inland Empire-Orange County trains, which do not pass through Union Station).

² California State Rail Plan, 2001-02 to 2010-11, January 2002, California Department of Transportation

³ California Passenger Rail System, 20-year Improvement Plan, March 2001, Amtrak

⁴ Source: SCRRA, Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service, 6/24/02.



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure ES-1: Union Station Vicinity Aerial Overview



Figure ES-2: Mission Junction Aerial Overview

major constraint to providing increased service levels and reliability to meet the forecasted growth in inter-city and regional train traffic.

Railroad passengers arriving at LAUS can transfer to two transit modes: subway/light rail and buses. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) operates a subway system (heavy-rail train) approximately 40 feet (12 meters) below ground level at LAUS. Currently, about 280 scheduled MTA Red Line movements occur daily at LAUS. The subway runs through the downtown area and then westward to as far west as the mid-Wilshire area, with a branch to North Hollywood. The subway provides a connection to MTA's Blue Line light-rail transit (LRT) service, which begins in a subway in the southern part of downtown Los Angeles and then transitions to street-level service to Long Beach. The MTA opened the Pasadena Gold Line LRT project in Summer 2003. The Pasadena Gold Line terminates at the old LAUS tracks 1 and 2, just south of LAUS Platform No. 2. The Gold Line includes a new platform that matches the floor height of LRT vehicles. MTA is planning an extension of the LRT service to East Los Angeles that would begin at the new LRT platform, pass over U.S. 101, and then transition to an at-grade alignment on Alameda Street. It should be noted that the Eastside LRT bridge over U.S. 101 is not designed to accommodate the weight of Metrolink and Amtrak trains.

LAUS is connected to the Patsouras Transit Center bus facility at the adjoining MTA headquarters building. The Transit Center serves regional bus routes operated by:

- Antelope Valley Transit (1 route)
- City of Los Angeles Commuter Express (1 route)
- Foothill Transit (10 routes)
- Gardena Municipal Bus Line (1 route)
- Montebello Municipal Bus Lines (5 routes)
- MTA (12 routes)
- Santa Clarita Transit (1 route)
- Santa Monica Municipal Bus Lines (Big Blue Bus) (1 route)
- Torrance Transit (2 routes).

In addition, LAUS and the Patsouras Transit Center are served by two local shuttle routes (LA DASH) operated by the City of Los Angeles. Amtrak bus service, which provides linkage to the Amtrak line in California's Central Valley (Bakersfield), operates from LAUS. Rental car service and taxis are also available at LAUS.

ES-2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The ~~proposed~~ Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project proposed by Caltrans would address three basic needs identified through an evaluation of transportation conditions, problems, and issues:

- Improve near-term operational efficiencies and scheduling reliability for trains using LAUS by reducing the constraint on train movements that results from stub-end operation. Current design of the station requires that all trains must enter and exit through the same set of lead

tracks to connect to the main lines, and are thus subject to delays either at the station platforms or on the connecting lead tracks while awaiting a slot at the platforms or access onto the main lines.

- Improve pedestrian access and functionality of the passenger platforms, while also improving connectivity with other transit services at LAUS (LRT, subway, and busses.) Pedestrian movements through LAUS are forecasted by MTA to increase from the current 40,000 persons per weekday to about 60,000 persons daily over the next decade. Improvements to railroad platforms would bring those that have not been previously renovated into ADA compliance. Converting Platforms Nos. 7 and 8, which were previously de-commissioned, back to utilization for passengers would provide a long-term increase in platform capacity at the station. The increase in platform capacity would serve forecasted growth to 2025 and beyond.
- Increase the capacity of LAUS to accommodate planned growth of Amtrak and SCRRRA train services. The number of trains using the station is forecasted to grow from 159 today to 222 by 2010 and 278 by 2025. Initial analysis indicated that acceptable levels of service reliability could be provided by the current facilities only through about 2010. After that date, as more trains are added, scheduling reliability would begin to deteriorate, especially during peak hours. This deterioration would arise as more and more trains attempt to move into and out of LAUS within constrained time periods. If trains were delayed, their planned “slots” for arrival/unloading/loading/departure could be lost or interfere with the slots of other trains. Fewer opportunities for schedule recovery would become available when the overall capacity of LAUS is approached.

It should be noted that LAUS currently includes a mail handling facility on its eastern edge. Mail is transferred between trains and tractor-trailers that move mail to and from local postal facilities. This transfer operation uses the spaces formerly occupied by Platform Nos. 7 and 8, and is in operation around the clock, 7 days a week. The space now used on Platform Nos. 7 and 8 for mail operations is needed to meet the forecasted demands for passenger trains. Previous planning by Amtrak identified a suitable location for the transfers to occur within Amtrak’s Redondo Junction property.

ES-3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STATUS

ES-3.1 Development of Alternatives

The issue of improving operations at Union Station was the subject of a Project Study Report (PSR) prepared for the California Department of Transportation (the Department) in June 2000. The PSR is a basic feasibility study to determine the initial concepts for transportation improvements and order of magnitude costs. The PSR identified run-through tracks as the basic solution to resolving the constraints of stub-end operations at LAUS. The concept of the run-through tracks would be to extend two tracks southward from Union Station on an aerial structure and provide a new connection into the BNSF-SCRRRA main line on the west side of the Los Angeles River. This would allow some of the trains that use the station to avoid the pull in/back out situation. The current operation of the station requires trains to pull into the terminal

and then reverse their direction of travel after unloading or loading passengers. Overall, the run-through tracks structure would form an S-curve, connecting at its north/west end to track platforms at Union Station and at its south/east end to some point along the BNSF main line in the vicinity of the 1st Street Bridge (see Figure ES-3).

In 2002, the Department and the Federal Railroad Administration initiated conceptual engineering and environmental analysis for run-through tracks in cooperation with Amtrak. An Alternatives Analysis (AA) process was begun to develop and screen a full range of potential alignments. The particular alignment and touchdown point on the main line are the focus of key decisions to be made in the AA. Three rounds of screening occurred. In the Initial Screening stage, 48 potential alignments were identified between U.S. 101 on the north and 4th Street on the south, and to the west of Alameda Street. Using engineering and environmental screening criteria, the 48 potential alignments were reduced to 7 conceptual alignments that appeared most reasonable. These seven alignments, all located north of 1st Street, were further screened using more refined engineering and environmental criteria. Since some of the conceptual alignments were very similar, they were collapsed through a combining process into four alternatives. A Second Screening was conducted for the four alternatives. Three of the alternative alignments were not desirable because they would entail numerous property acquisitions, including important public agency properties where relocation would be difficult, or a site with special manufacturing where relocation would be expensive. The initial result of the Second Screening was the identification of Alternative A as a good combination of high engineering values and low environmental impacts that should be assessed in detail in an environmental document. Upon reviewing the anticipated impacts for Alternative A at the end of the Second Screening, the question arose as to whether a variation(s) of that alignment could be developed that captured its benefits, while avoiding the conflicts with the planned Commercial Street widening and minimizing right-of-way impacts to businesses along the Alternative A alignment. To create an alignment that would be further north than Alternative A, it became clear that the concept of crossing the freeway with a single structure that accommodated two tracks (consolidated from four tracks adjacent to Platform Nos. 2 and 3) was constraining curvatures and grades in the vicinity of Commercial Street. A concept to carry four tracks across the freeway would allow the alignment to shift closer to U.S. 101. Four variations of this concept were developed and analyzed in a Supplemental Screening process, resulting in the identification of Alternative A-1 as the second alternative to be addressed in this environmental document. Additional information on the development and screening process is provided in Chapter 2.

A bridge type evaluation was performed to evaluate and identify the optimum type of structure for the various segments of the elevated run-through tracks structure. The bridge type recommended by the project engineering team for crossing over U.S. 101 is a steel deck-plate girder (DPG). The recommended bridge type for the trestle segment (from south of U.S. 101 to the BNSF mainline touchdown point) is a combination of precast/prestressed concrete box girder (PC/PS), steel deck-plate girder, steel through-plate girder (TPG), and mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) structures, depending on the alignment of the alternative.

The two identified alternatives, Alternative A and Alternative A-1, in conjunction with the No-Build Alternative, are the candidate alternatives for the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project and are the subject of this environmental document. The alignments of Alternative A and A-1 are shown on Figure ES-4 and Figure ES-5, respectively.

Subsequent to the issuance of the Draft EIR/EIS for review and comment, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. ~~Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative.~~

For the purposes of this Final EIR/EIS, text boxes have been added in the Executive Summary and in Chapter 2 and elsewhere to highlight this change in circumstances. ~~However, references to Alternative A have not been removed throughout the document.~~



Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure ES-3: Aerial Alignment Alternatives Across U.S. 101



Source: Imagecat, Inc., 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure ES-4: Overall Alignment of Alternative A



Source: Imagecat, Inc., 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure ES-5: Overall Alignment of Alternative A-1

ES-3.2 No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, the existing “stub-end” rail configuration at the LAUS would remain. The No-Build Alternative includes the SCRRA’s recently completed 5th Lead Project that provides additional capacity for movement through the throat area of LAUS by extending the existing lead No. 1, but makes no changes to other parts or functions of the system. The No-Build Alternative also includes the following transportation projects in the vicinity:

- U.S. 101 freeway widening and ramp reconfiguration project (by the Department)
- Eastside Light-Rail Extension Project (by Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority), including both a revenue alignment and service leads
- Pasadena Gold Line Light-Rail Extension Project (by Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority)
- Widening of 1st Street Bridge Project (by City of Los Angeles)
- Commercial Street Widening Project, between Alameda and Center Streets (by Los Angeles Department of Transportation)
- Union Station traffic circulation improvements (by Catellus)
- High-Speed Rail conceptual terminal locations for Union Station (by California High-Speed Rail Authority)
- MAGLEV conceptual terminal location for Union Station (by Southern California Association of Governments)
- Existing city streets.

ES-3.3 Alternative A

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

Alternative A would extend some bi-directional running tracks from the existing stub-end track configuration at LAUS to the south and east to provide “run-through” capabilities for four of the ten stub-end tracks at LAUS. Tracks 3 to 6 would extend south of Union Station on the bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 and then transition to two tracks at the freeway median. The width of the structure at the edge of LAUS would be approximately 70 feet (21 meters) to accommodate the four run-through tracks, tapering to approximately 45 feet (14 meters) as the four tracks merge into two tracks on the south side of U.S. 101. The column-supported trestle structure would begin north of Commercial Street (near Hewitt Street), extend eastward between Commercial Street and Ducommun Street (to approximately Center Street). The trestle alignment

runs south of Commercial Street, and would pass above a commercial building. At Center Street, it would transition southward as it crosses over the Red Line Tunnel structure and Eastside LRT maintenance lead, and descend to connect with the SCRRA main tracks at the BNSF yard before 1st Street (north of the 1st Street Bridge) along the west bank of Los Angeles River. The trestle would provide 16.5 feet of clearance over city streets. Figure ES-4 shows the overall alignment of Alternative A.

ES-3.4 Alternative A-1

Alternative A-1 would include a bridge over U.S. 101 that uniformly accommodates four run-through tracks. In doing this, the bridge structure over U.S. 101 would be able to be designed with greater curvature, which in turn allows the east-west alignment to be shifted northward (compared to Alternative A).


After crossing U.S. 101, the four tracks would transition to two, and the trestle would extend east along the north side of Commercial Street, then turn south such that the tracks would descend to grade and reconnect to the existing SCRRA mainline tracks (north of 1st Street) along the west bank of Los Angeles River. Figure ES-5 shows the overall alignment of Alternative A-1. Figure ES-3 shows the alignments of Alternative A and A-1. Alternative A-1 differs from Alternative A primarily in the curvature of the bridge crossing over U.S. 101 (the transition from four tracks to two tracks occurs at N. Vignes Street, rather than in the middle of U.S. 101 for Alternative A) and in the location of the east-west structure south of U.S. 101. Alternative A-1 would run north of Commercial Street until reaching Center Street, whereas Alternative A would be south of Commercial. Alternative A-1 would cross Center Street at a skew angle, requiring a realignment of Center Street and demolition of a building (or portion of a building) at the northeast corner of Center and Commercial.

Subsequent to the Draft EIR/EIS, Alternative A-1 was identified as the preferred alternative. Overall, Alternative A-1 has fewer environmental impacts than Alternative A, especially with regard to acquisitions and displacements. As noted above, the Alternative A alignment now includes a new two-story warehouse/office building that was not present when the Draft EIR/EIS was prepared. Due to this change, Alternative A has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

ES-3.4.1 Changes to LAUS

Both alternatives would include changes within the Union Station complex. See Figure ES-6 for an aerial view of the portions of Union Station where platforms and tracks would be changed. Improvements would consist of various track, platform, service road, and station improvements, including the following:

- As part of either build alternative, a new Amtrak Mail Transfer Facility would be built at Redondo Junction, an Amtrak property just north of Washington Boulevard and east of 16th Street to replace the current facility at LAUS. No other area of LAUS can accommodate the mail functions.



Source: HDR, Inc, 2003.

Figure ES-6: Platform and Track Changes at Union Station

- Modifications to switches and tracks in the “throat” area where trains enter/exit LAUS to provide linkages to new LAUS platforms
- Elimination of the existing Mail Facility along the northeastern side of the LAUS to accommodate the new platforms. The mail facility would be relocated to other Amtrak property at Redondo Junction.
- Construction of new platforms (Platform Nos. 7 and 8) and reintroduction of tracks (Tracks 13, 14, 15, and 16) at the east end of the station. The new platforms and tracks would provide replacement capacity for when Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 are under modification.
- Raising the elevation of existing platforms (Platform Nos. 2 and 3) and the associated tracks (Tracks 3, 4, 5, and 6) to match the elevation of a new railroad bridge structure over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101 for the run-through tracks. The platforms and tracks must be elevated by about 5 feet at their south ends in order to provide a minimum clearance for the railroad bridge over the El Monte Busway of 16.5 feet.
- Reconstruction of portions of the passenger tunnel and some ramps to accommodate the new and reconstructed platforms.
- Reconstruction of the service/baggage-handling road at the south end of the platforms. The service road would be depressed by up to 15 feet (4.6 meters) from the current grade to provide adequate clearance beneath the new run-through tracks bridge structure for baggage vehicles and operations. The new depressed service road would also include a baggage car access road. Once the baggage road returns to grade, it would provide access to the platforms.
- Construction and reconstruction of accessory facilities such as retaining walls, switches, turnout tracks, etc.

In September 2004, Amtrak announced that it intended to exit the mail and express business in order to concentrate on its core business of transporting passengers. As a result, the issue of whether Amtrak would need to build a new Amtrak Mail Transfer Facility at Redondo Junction as a result of the elimination of the existing Mail Facility along the northeastern side of the LAUS to accommodate new platforms is unclear at this time. In the interest of full disclosure, the Final EIR/EIS retains the discussions and analysis of the impacts of the construction of a new facility should a decision be made in the future that a new facility at Redondo Junction is necessary or appropriate.

ES-3.5 Environmental Process

FRA and the Department initiated the environmental process for the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project in June 2002. A joint CEQA/NEPA document, an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), is being prepared for the proposed project. The FRA is the lead agency for the evaluation of environmental impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA) (42 USC 4321, et seq.). FRA is overseeing the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) components of the joint EIR/EIS document. The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare this EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on Wednesday, June 18, 2002. (FR 41749, Vol. 67, No. 118.) The NEPA scoping period closed on July 29, 2002. The NOI announced the FRA’s intent to prepare an EIS in accordance with NEPA, and provided formal notice of the opportunity to

comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings. The NOI also included information on the project background, study area, potential alternatives, probable effects to be studied, FRA procedures, relevant scoping meeting information and contact information.

The Department is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) SCH No. 2002061071, for the proposed project to address the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.). Environmental staff from The Department's District 7 (Los Angeles) office is overseeing the environmental process on behalf of the Department. The Department's Rail Program staff (in Sacramento) is overseeing the development and analysis of proposed physical and operational changes.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was mailed by District 7 on June 18, 2002, to the State Clearinghouse and to a project-specific mailing list. The NOP announced the Department's intent to prepare an EIR pursuant to CEQA. Like the NOI, it provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings and commenced the CEQA scoping period. The NOI also advised California agencies of their obligation to comment on the proposed project within 30 days. The CEQA scoping period closed on July 22, 2002, thirty days after the official posting date. The NOP also included information on the proposed project, alternatives, anticipated effects, scoping meeting information, and contact information. The NOP included a preview of anticipated project impacts via a CEQA Initial Study Checklist (IS).

In addition to the NOP mailings, a one-page Scoping notice was also prepared which summarized the proposed project and announced the time and location of the public Scoping meeting on June 24, 2002. The Scoping notice was mailed to 1508 businesses, churches, organizations, property owners, and residents within the study area on June 13, 2002.

Five newspaper notices were placed announcing the Scoping meetings. All notices included the information about the scoping meetings, a project map, and contact information. The newspapers were chosen for their circulation and audience. For example, the *Los Angeles Downtown News* is distributed throughout central and downtown Los Angeles. The *Rafu Shimpo* newspaper serves the cultural Japanese, and the community of Little Tokyo. The *Chinese Daily News* serves the cultural Chinese population and Chinatown. *La Opinion* newspaper is circulated to the Latino audience of Los Angeles.

Additionally, the notices were published in four different languages, (i.e., English, Japanese, Spanish and Mandarin Chinese.) An English language notice was placed in the *Los Angeles Downtown News*, on June 17, 2002. Two notices, one in English, the other in Japanese, were placed in the *Rafu Shimpo* newspaper in the June 15, 2002, edition. In the *Chinese Daily News*, a Mandarin Chinese language notice was placed and ran in the June 13, 2002, edition. On June 15, 2002, a Spanish language notice was run in *La Opinion*.

The two Scoping meetings were held in an open house format with information stations and illustrated display boards. Members representing District 7, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the project consultant team staffed the meetings. One meeting, held on June 24, 2002, from 5 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Union Station room in the headquarters of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, was held for the general public. Twenty-one members of the public attended the meeting. At the public Scoping meeting, Chinese, Japanese and Spanish

interpreters were present for non-English speaking members of the public. Public comment forms, two board displays, and project fact sheets were also provided in four languages: English, Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese. The other meeting, held on June 25, 2002, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. at the offices of Myra L. Frank and Associates, Inc., 811 W. 7th Street, was held for public agencies. A total of nine members of public agencies attended the meeting. Both meetings opened with the same Powerpoint presentation and subsequent question and answer period.

Additionally, Scoping meetings were also held individually with several stakeholders. The stakeholders were the Los Angeles Conservancy, Friedman Bag Company, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County Supervisorial District 1, City of Los Angeles, Mayor Hahn's Office, City of Los Angeles Council Districts 9 and 14, City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works, City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, and City of Los Angeles Department of Planning. The various City departments are now involved in ongoing coordination with the project team.

The NEPA public review period began with the publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on Friday, September 10, 2004. The CEQA public review period began with the posting of the Notice of Availability at the Los Angeles County Clerk on September 3, 2004, and the receipt of the Notice of Completion at the State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, on Friday, September 9, 2004.

Newspaper advertisements noticing the public hearing and the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS were published on two separate occasions in the following five newspapers: *Downtown News*, *Rafu Shimpo*, *Chinese Daily News*, *La Opinion*, *Los Angeles Times*. The first printing occurred within all five of the above newspapers between the dates of September 6 and 10, 2004. It announced the proposed project and the beginning of the public review period. The second printing occurred between October 4 and 8, 2004. It reminded the public of the upcoming public hearing.

Copies of the document were mailed to responsible and trustee agencies and to those who had previously requested a copy of the document. An electronic copy of the document was placed on the project website, www.runthroughtracks.org, and physical copies of the document were placed in the following locations: Benjamin Franklin Library; Chinatown Branch Library; Los Angeles Public Library, Science Department; Little Tokyo Library; California Department of Transportation.

Any property owner who would be potentially affected by the proposed project was notified of this via posting of the Notice of Availability at the Los Angeles County Clerk, the newspaper advertising, and the mailing distribution of the Draft EIR/EIS. Personal delivery of the document (by the public outreach consultant) to any businesses that would directly be affected by the proposed project occurred on October 6, 2004. Specifically, four complete sets of documents were hand delivered to the Los Angeles Police Department, Property Division; Viertel's Automotive Service; Mrs. Friday's-Fishking Processors, Inc.; and B & Z Investments, Inc.

All persons on the project mailing list received Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS. The project mailing list was developed over the course of the project and includes persons notified of or responding to scoping, attendees at public information meetings, and those who asked to be added to the mailing list via the project website or other correspondence. (See Table 7-1, Draft EIR/EIS Distribution List, and Table 27-2, Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List.)

Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS were accepted via the project website; in writing via fax, email or mail; by phone; and at the public hearing (oral and written). The FRA and the Department held a public hearing near the project location. It was on October 13, 2004, from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the MTA Building, 1 Gateway Plaza, 3rd Floor Conference Room, Los Angeles, CA, 90012. The close of the comment periods was close of business on October 25, 2004.

Comments were submitted in the following manner: in writing, mailed to the persons named below; in writing at the public hearing; to a court reporter at the public hearing; via email at the project Internet website, www.runthroughtracks.org.

Comments were addressed to either (or both) of the following persons: David Valenstein, Federal Railroad Administration, Gary Iverson, California Department of Transportation District 7.

All comments received were considered, and responses to substantive comments were addressed in Chapter 12, Comments and Responses. Chapter 11, Clarifications and Modifications, indicates where corresponding edits or corrections to the Draft EIR/EIS were made in response to the comments received.

ES-3.6 Next Steps

The Final EIR/EIS will be distributed to those agencies, organizations, and persons who commented substantively on the Draft EIR/EIS, as well as to any persons requesting a copy. Please see Table 7-3 for a full distribution list. The Notice of Availability will be distributed to any responsible and trustee agencies and persons, businesses, and organizations that have an interest or have expressed an interest in the proposed project. Please see Table 7-4 for the Notice of Availability distribution list.

Prior to approving the proposed project, the Department must certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and that the FEIR and a Notice of Determination will be filed in accordance with CEQA, NEPA, and department requirements. Additionally, the information contained in the FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the agencies. When the FRA completes its approval process, a Record of Decision will be filed in accordance with NEPA procedures.

Pursuant to CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program will be developed to ensure the implementation of the adopted mitigation measures; those measures shall be fully enforceable. The Department will adopt the mitigation monitoring program in conjunction with the findings required under CEQA at the time it considers certification of the FEIR and decides whether to approve the project.

Although construction funding is not currently available, construction could begin if significant funds are identified.

ES-4 OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

ES-4.1 Summary of Impacts

The majority of environmental areas analyzed were found to be Not Adverse or Less than Adverse under NEPA and to have No Impact or Less than Significant Impact under CEQA, when compliance with regulatory compliance is considered. Applicable regulatory compliance, which includes permits and other standard practices that would be legally necessary as part of any major construction project, is listed in Tables ES-1. These areas require no mitigation measures beyond regulatory compliance:

- Acquisitions and Displacements
- Biological Resources (including Wetlands)
- Energy
- Executive Orders
- Hazardous Materials
- Land Use/Planning
- Railroad Operations
- Safety/Security
- Population, Housing & Employment
- Utility Disruptions
- Water and Water Quality (including Floodplains).

The following environmental areas were found to be Potentially Adverse or Adverse under NEPA and/or to have Potentially Significant or Significant Impacts under CEQA, and to require mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than adverse/less than significant level. Proposed mitigation measures are listed in Table ES-1.

- Air Quality
- Community Services
- Cultural Resources
- Geologic/Seismic
- Noise
- Traffic (construction-period only).

Under NEPA, there are no environmental areas for which there would be remainder adverse impacts after proposed mitigation measures are considered.

Under CEQA, there would be remainder significant air quality impacts. There would be no remainder impacts for any other environmental areas.

ES-4.2 Summary Table

Table ES-1 summarizes the environmental impacts associated with Alternatives A and A-1. The table shows the initial level of impact under NEPA and CEQA; followed by citations of impact reductions that would occur either through compliance with environmental regulations or other mitigation measures; and the resulting level of impact when compliance or mitigation is considered.

For impacts that are assessed under NEPA, the level of impact is expressed in terms of whether it is *not adverse*, *potentially adverse*, or *adverse*. NEPA assessments often do not have specific impact criteria and documents typically do not specify whether impacts are significant. CEQA, on the other hand, requires that determinations of significance be made. Accordingly for impacts assessed under CEQA the level of impact is expressed in terms of whether it is *not significant* (or no effect), *less than significant*, *potentially significant*, or *significant* when compared to specific criteria of significance.

Subsequent to the Draft EIR/EIS, Alternative A-1 was identified as the locally preferred alternative. Overall, Alternative A-1 has fewer environmental impacts than Alternative A, especially with regard to acquisitions and displacements. As noted above, the Alternative A alignment now includes a new two-story warehouse/office building that was not present when the Draft EIR/EIS was prepared. Due to this change, Alternative A has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

ES-5 AGENCY COORDINATION

Agency consultation and participation has been on-going throughout the life of the project. Monthly Project Development Team (PDT) meetings were held at Amtrak offices in Los Angeles at Union Station from the beginning of the screening process, and these meetings are scheduled to continue throughout the life of the proposed project. The PDT meetings were attended by Amtrak; Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF); State of California, Department of Transportation; Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA); Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA); City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation and the project consultant team

The proposed project was presented to responsible federal agencies with jurisdiction over and or interest in the proposed project through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) scoping process. In addition to issuance of the Notice of Intent by FRA in the *Federal Register* of June 18, 2002, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was mailed to federal, state and local agencies by the Department on June 18. The NOP included an Initial Checklist that identified anticipated project impacts. Nine agencies attended a Scoping meeting on June 25, 2002. Additionally, Scoping meetings were also held individually with several stakeholders. The stakeholders were the Los Angeles Conservancy, Friedman Bag Company, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County Supervisorial District 1, City of Los Angeles, Mayor Hahn's Office, City of Los Angeles Council Districts 9 and 14, City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works, City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, and City of Los Angeles Department of Planning. The various City departments are now involved in ongoing coordination with the project team.

Simultaneously, the Section 106 process has been occurring/progressing. Please see the discussion in Chapter 3-5, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 5, Agency Coordination. In summary, the California SHPO sent a letter concurring with FRA's findings of National Register eligibility and effects on historic and architectural resources but had comments on the information provided on two archaeological resources. The letter was included in Appendix B of the Draft EIR/EIS. A reply letter was sent to the California SHPO on January 13, 2005, by Caltrans on behalf of FRA. It can be found in Chapter 11, Clarifications and Modifications.

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-1 – Acquisitions and Displacements | | | | |
| <p>Alternative A: Full acquisition of 4 parcels; 3 aerial easements</p> <p>Note that subsequent to the Draft EIR/EIS, one of the parcels on the Alternative A alignment now includes a new two-story warehouse/office building</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA)</p> <p>Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>Purchases would be at fair market value. Relocation assistance would be provided in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, section 6018 of the Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Guidelines (California Code of Regulations), and the provisions of the California Relocation Act (Government Code sections 7260-7277).</p> | <p>No additional mitigation measures required</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA)</p> <p>Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |
| <p>Alternative A-1: Full acquisition of 3 parcels; 1 aerial easement</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA)</p> <p>Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>See regulatory requirement above.</p> | <p>No additional mitigation measures required</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA)</p> <p>Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-2 – Air Quality | | | | |
| Construction-Period Impacts for Both Build Alternatives | Not Adverse (NEPA) Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements for NEPA. Compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 for control of fugitive dust | <p>To address nitrous oxide pollution, the following measures are proposed:</p> <p>AQ-1: Equipment shall not be allowed to idle for more 10 minutes.</p> <p>AQ-2: Contractors shall be encouraged to use newer equipment</p> <p>AQ-3: Contractors shall be encouraged to use bio-diesel.</p> <p>To address particulate pollution, the following measure is proposed:</p> <p>AQ-4: In addition to compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, contractors shall be encouraged to use newer equipment</p> <p><u>AQ-5: Streets will be swept at the end of each day if visible soil is carried onto streets.</u></p> <p><u>AQ-6: Wheel washers will be installed where vehicles enter and exit construction sites, or truck wheels will be washed down by hoses for each trip off the site.</u></p> <p><u>AQ-7: Non-toxic soil stabilizers will be applied to inactive constructive areas.</u></p> | Not Adverse (NEPA) Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Long-Term Impacts for Both Build Alternatives | Not Adverse (NEPA) | Project meets NEPA-required Transportation Conformity | None required under NEPA. | Not Adverse (NEPA) |
| Under CEQA-Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) emissions exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) daily thresholds. | Significant (CEQA) | | None proposed under CEQA- All proposed EPA emission reductions for railroad engines have been incorporated. Project implementation would reduce overall CO and ROG levels compared to No Build. | Significant (CEQA) |
| Section 3-3 – Biological Resources | | | | |
| Habitats and Wetlands Both Build Alternatives: No long term adverse (significant) impacts to native plant communities, candidate and sensitive plants and wildlife, wetlands or riparian habitats would result from construction or operation of the proposed project because none are present within the project area. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | Although no impacts to biological resources were identified, the proposed project would comply with the requirements of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to ensure that biological species and habitats are protected. | No additional mitigation measures required. The project would voluntarily comply the City's Street Tree Division policy to the extent possible, which would minimize any impacts resulting from removal or displacement of any non-native parkway trees during construction. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Nesting Birds Both Build Alternatives: Potential construction-period impacts to nesting birds if present in trees along streets that would need to be removed. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | Compliance with Migratory Bird Treaty Act (if construction involves removal of migratory bird nests during the breeding season) to assure protection to biological species. | Although no impacts to biological resources were identified, if construction occurs during the breeding season, a qualified biologist will investigate any trees to be removed to ascertain whether birds' nests are present. If nests are present, they will be relocated if possible, or work will need to be managed in the area to avoid disturbing nesting birds. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-4 – Community Facilities and Services | | | | |
| <p>Police Protection Services Both Build Alternatives: No long-term impacts. Potential impacts to police protection services during construction from traffic and access disruptions on emergency response time.</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>No regulatory requirements.</p> | <p>Although no adverse (no significant) impacts to police protection services are anticipated, the following measure shall be implemented as part of an overall Traffic Management Program (TMP) to minimize potential construction impacts. PS-1 Prior to initiation of any construction activities that may interfere with emergency service and access, the construction contractor shall consult and coordinate with the Amtrak Police, LASD, and LAPD to ensure disruption is minimized and to identify alternative routes for emergency vehicles.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |
| <p>Fire Protection Services Both Build Alternatives: No long-term impacts. Potential impacts to fire protection services during construction from traffic and access disruptions on emergency response time.</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>No regulatory requirements.</p> | <p>Although no adverse (no significant) impacts to fire protection services are anticipated, the following measure shall be implemented as part of an overall Traffic Management Program (TMP) to minimize potential construction impacts: FPS-1 Project engineers shall consult with the City Engineer and the City of Los Angeles Fire Department to ensure adequate access for Fire Department vehicles and equipment. FPS-2 The proposed project shall comply with all applicable codes and regulations administered by the State Architect and State Fire Marshall. FPS-3 Prior to initiation of any construction activities that may interfere with emergency service and access, the construction contractor shall consult and coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department to ensure disruption is minimized and to identify alternative routes for emergency vehicles.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| <p>Pedestrian/Vehicular Access Both Build Alternatives: No long-term impacts. Potential impacts during construction to pedestrian and vehicular access to community facilities during construction.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>No regulatory requirements.</p> | <p>Please see Section 3-3, Air Quality, and Section 3-12, Noise, for measures to mitigate construction air quality and noise impacts. Temporary access changes are not adverse under NEPA. Although no significant impacts (CEQA) to pedestrian or vehicular access are anticipated, the following measure shall be implemented as part of an overall Traffic Management Program (TMP) to minimize potential construction period impacts. SPS-1 Contractors shall ensure that safe and convenient pedestrian routes to schools are maintained during construction. SPS-2 Entrances to the LAUSD maintenance facility would not be blocked during construction.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-5 – Cultural Resources | | | | |
| <p>Archaeological Resources Both Build Alternatives: Potentially significant impacts to two known archeological resources. Potentially significant impacts during construction if unanticipated resources are encountered at Union Station, in U.S. 101 ROW, or other project locations.</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>The project will be implemented in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act and the Native American Graves Protection Act; the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1), including, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines; Section 7050.5 of the State Health Code.</p> | <p>The following mitigation measures shall apply at Site CA-LAN-1575/H and site AE-UPT-01 and to unanticipated discoveries of archeological resources. These mitigation measures will also be incorporated into a Memorandum of Agreement among the FRA, FHWA, Amtrak, SHPO and the California Department of Transportation. CR-1 Stipulations in the MOA for archaeological resources would address: • How and when archaeological resources will be identified and evaluated; • How impacts to significant resources will be minimized; • How significant resources will be treated to mitigate unavoidable impacts; • Who will participate in consultation during the Project; and • How the consultation will be undertaken. CR-2 Prior to construction, FRA and the California Department of Transportation will prepare an archeological testing and evaluation plan that will target areas within the archaeological APE most likely to contain buried cultural resources. A Native American Burial Agreement will be prepared as part of this plan (see CR-5 below). This Burial Agreement will apply to all discoveries of Native American remains made during the Project. In order to achieve Section 106 and CEQA compliance, a combined program of extended archival research and subsurface test excavation (if hazardous materials conditions allow) will be</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Less than Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Archaeology, continued | | | <p>conducted to ensure that the Run-Through Tracks Project will identify and evaluate significant archaeological resources. This program will include site-specific archival research to aid in identifying target areas that may contain potentially important prehistoric, protohistoric, and historical archaeological resources. Archival research would result in a research design and work plan focused on the physical identification of intact subsurface archaeological remains. Prior to construction, Phase II archeological testing will be conducted in areas most likely to contain buried cultural resources.</p> <p>CR-3 If resources are discovered during Phase II testing prior to construction, they will be evaluated for significance with criteria set forth in the testing plan. Initial studies should be directed toward evaluation of site significance per criteria set forth in 36 CFR 60.4 to assess the site's eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP. To achieve this goal, an archaeological testing strategy (if hazardous materials conditions permit) that balances definition of data potentials and realization of those potentials would be used. These investigations would be designed to (1) define the extent, content, integrity, age, occupation units or components, and research potentials of each site, (2) define spatial, temporal and cultural relationships among sites within and near the study area; (3) advance knowledge of local and regional history and prehistory by addressing explicit research questions; (4) assess potential Projects effects if a cultural property proves eligible for the NRHP; and (5) define key parameters (e.g. extent, structure, age, contents, and integrity) of each site sufficiently to define a treatment program.</p> | |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Archaeology, continued | | | <p>CR-4 If significant archaeological deposits are found during test excavations prior to construction, a mitigation plan will be developed to ensure that important archaeological data are not lost. The mitigation plan will include methods by which prehistoric, protohistoric, and historical archaeological deposits will be avoided or recovered prior to construction. Specific provisions will also be made for the analysis of artifacts, report preparation and dissemination, and curation and disposition of artifacts consistent with the National Park Service Guidelines (36 CFR 49).</p> <p>Impacts to significant finds will be mitigated through a data-recovery program using appropriate archaeological field and laboratory methods (hazardous materials conditions permitting), pursuant to the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines (48 FR 44716-44742). Since the Project would involve significant excavation, the Project timeline must accommodate a time prior to Project construction to allow for identification and evaluation of cultural resources, and for full recovery of the significant subsurface resources that would be affected by the Project.</p> <p>Subsequent monitoring following Phase 3 data-recovery may be necessary during construction. As demonstrated on the other urban Los Angeles project some resources may be buried beneath historic surfaces and defy discovery until actual Project construction. Because Native American concerns have been established, additional monitoring may be warranted. This monitoring will follow the procedures outlined in CR-6 below.</p> | |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Archaeology, continued | | | <p>CR-5 Prior to pre-construction testing, data-recovery and construction, a Native American Burial Agreement to recover and respectfully treat human remains will be developed in accordance with all legal requirements, and in consultation with Project agencies, the SHPO, and a Most Likely Descendant. If human remains are encountered during archaeological excavation or during construction, all excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie human remains will stop.</p> <p>If human remains are exposed during construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. Construction will halt in the area of the discovery of human remains, the area will be protected, and consultation and treatment will occur as prescribed by law.</p> <p>Cultural Resources Identification, Evaluation and Mitigation During Construction:</p> <p>CR-6 Because additional unrecorded and unanticipated archaeological deposits, and possibly Native American or other human remains, are likely to be encountered during construction, monitoring of construction will occur, unless the presence of hazardous materials precludes monitoring. Native American monitoring will also take place, as requested by interested Native American parties. Prior to construction, a Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered During Project Implementation will be prepared as an addendum to</p> | |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Archaeology, continued | | | <p>the MOA, outlining the process by which the FRA will resolve any adverse effects upon newly discovered historic properties during the implementation of the Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13(a)(2). The Treatment Plan will detail where monitoring will take place, monitoring procedures, and procedures to be followed if cultural resources are discovered.</p> <p>Types of resources likely to be found, the prehistoric and historical archaeological research domains relevant to site significance, research questions, and data requirements will be detailed. The treatment options for each historic property class and detailed procedures for implementing treatment will be spelled out. Procedures for curation of materials recovered during site treatment and report requirements will be addressed. Finally, a Native American Burial Agreement will be prepared as part of this Treatment Plan (see CR-5).</p> | |
| <p>Historic Properties Both Build Alternatives: No adverse/significant impacts would occur to known historic properties because project changes would not affect character-defining features.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106.</p> | <p>None required. However, a Memorandum of Agreement will be developed among FRA, California Department of Transportation, Amtrak, the SHPO and to provide mechanisms so that further design development minimizes harm to historic property (i.e. LAUS), primarily through treatment, design review, comment, and design revision.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| <p>Paleontological Resources Both Build Alternatives: No long-term impacts. Potentially significant impact if unique paleontological artifacts are encountered during construction</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>No regulatory requirements.</p> | <p>Although no known resources were identified in the area, the following measures shall be implemented during construction: P-1 A qualified paleontologist will monitor pile excavation spoils and surface excavations when the excavations reaching into older deposits (Pleistocene older alluvium or the Fernando Formation) are likely to yield such resources. The depths of sensitive deposits and/or areas of concern in the project area will be identified along the pile locations prior to development of the construction specifications. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units are determined upon exposure and examination by a qualified paleontologist to have a low potential to contain fossil resources. P-2 Paleontologic monitors shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are brought to the surface. Monitors shall be empowered to temporarily halt construction or divert equipment to facilitate removal of larger specimens, if applicable. P-3 Recovered intact specimens shall be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. P-4 Intact specimens shall be identified and curated into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage. P-5 A finding report will be prepared with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. The report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Less than Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-6 – Energy (NEPA Only) | | | | |
| Fuel Consumption Both Build Alternatives: Construction-period vehicle fuel consumption would not result in an adverse impact to energy resources. | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | Requirements for implementation of regular equipment maintenance are typically contained in Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) (required under Clean Water Act Section 402) Best Management Practices (BMPs). | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |
| Vehicle Trips Both Build Alternatives: Long term, the project would result in a reduction in vehicle trips, saving 34,428 gallons per day of petroleum fuel. | Beneficial (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Beneficial (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |
| Need for New Infrastructure Both Build Alternatives: Additional demand for operations would not require new infrastructure to produce or deliver electricity and gas to the region. | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | The project will incorporate energy conservation features in the design of the station modifications and track control and signal systems that will comply with applicable codes and regulations. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |
| Section 3-7 – Executive Orders (NEPA Only) | | | | |
| Executive Order Conflicts Both Build Alternatives: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with any Executive Orders. | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management; Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands; Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations; Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-8 – Geologic/Seismic | | | | |
| Unstable Slopes Both Build Alternatives: Unstable temporary slopes during construction would be a potentially significant impact. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | All earthwork and grading must comply with State of California codes. All excavation and shoring systems would meet the minimum requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Accelerated Erosion Both Build Alternatives: Accelerated erosion during construction would be a potentially significant impact. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | Erosion control during site construction is regulated and requires application of Best Management Practices. Construction industry standard storm water BMPs are provided in the State of California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook, Construction Activity. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Contaminated Soil or Groundwater Both Build Alternatives: Excavations for foundation footings and piles may encounter contaminated soils or groundwater, which would result in a potentially adverse (significant) impact. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | If contaminated groundwater or soil were encountered at the site, it would be handled in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Subsurface Gas Both Build Alternatives: Excavations for foundation footings and piles may encounter shallow subsurface gas. If shallow subsurface gas is present within the proposed project site, a potentially significant or adverse impact would result. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | OSHA regulations cover potential worker exposure to subsurface gases during construction. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| <p>Abandoned Oil Wells Both Build Alternatives: If undocumented abandoned oil wells or dry holes are encountered during excavation or grading activities, a significant or adverse impact would result.</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>The City of Los Angeles and Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) regulate construction activities over or near abandoned wells and dry holes. Wells and dry holes under or in close proximity to construction must be plugged and abandoned in accordance with current DOGGR regulations. By conforming to existing state and city requirements, adverse impacts associated with abandoned wells or dry holes are not anticipated.</p> | <p>No additional mitigation measures are required</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |
| <p>Settlement or Subsidence Both Build Alternatives: The proposed project would increase loads placed on existing underlying earth materials. Settlement or subsidence caused by additional loads represents a potential adverse (significant) impact</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>No regulatory requirements.</p> | <p>GE-1 During Final Design, project design will evaluate potential subsidence or settlement caused by additional loads from fill and retaining walls, especially when trains are present. Final project design will ensure that site subsidence or settlement does not result in impacts to adjacent structures. In order to evaluate these issues, a final geotechnical report shall be prepared before final design of proposed structures, and recommendations provided in this report shall be implemented, as appropriate.</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |
| Section 3-9 – Hazardous Materials | | | | |
| <p>Exposure to Hazardous Materials Both Build Alternatives: Potentially adverse (significant) impacts from the removal, handling, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction and operation.</p> | <p>Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA)</p> | <p>Consultations with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department, State Department of Toxic Substance Control, and Regional Water Quality Control Board, and compliance with stipulated local and state regulations and regulated and/or permitted construction requirements will minimize potential</p> | <p>No additional mitigation measures are required</p> | <p>Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA)</p> |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Hazardous Materials, continued | | <p>for hazardous materials impacts resulting from removal of hazardous materials during construction.</p> <p>A Health and Safety Plan will be developed to guide all construction activities. The health and safety plan will meet the requirements of 29 CFR 1910 and all other applicable federal, state, and local regulations and requirements.</p> <p>Removal of aboveground and underground storage tanks within the proposed project corridor, if present, may be required by the Los Angeles City Fire Department. All procedures for removing tanks, including sampling procedures, must be in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.</p> <p>If an unexpected release of hazardous substances is found in reportable quantities, the National Response Center must be notified and clean-up coordinated with environmental agencies.</p> <p>Potential exposure of construction workers to asbestos contaminated materials (ACM) shall be minimized through disclosure of the potential presence of ACM's for demolition and renovation of structures that were constructed prior to 1979. Asbestos sampling surveys shall be conducted on any building material prior to demolition or renovation.</p> | | |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Hazardous Materials, continued | | <p>Prior to demolition or renovation of buildings or structures that were constructed prior to 1979, the project contractor shall prepare an Operations and Maintenance Plan that meets all applicable federal, state, and local requirements.</p> <p>Potential exposure of construction workers to lead based paint (LBP) shall be minimized through disclosure of the potential presence of LBP for demolition and renovation of structures located within the proposed alignment that were constructed prior to 1979. Prior to any demolition or renovation to be conducted on any painted surfaces at the project site, a LBP survey shall be conducted by the contractor to determine the level of risk posed to construction personnel from exposure to the paints present at the site.</p> <p>Groundwater sampling surveys for contaminants in concentrations above accepted state and federal regulatory levels shall be conducted prior to the commencement of pylon, abutment, and other intrusive construction activities that will be expected to contact groundwater. If a temporary fuel tank is used during construction, it will be stored within a</p> | | |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Hazardous Materials, continued | | bermed and sealed secondary containment structure. A Spill Prevention Control and Counter Measure (SPCC) plan will be prepared and enforced to ensure that any spills are contained and properly disposed of. | | |
| Section 3-10 – Land Use and Planning | | | | |
| Land Use and Planning Both Build Alternatives: No long-term or short-term adverse (significant) impacts on land use and planning in the project area. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Section 3-11 – Noise and Vibration | | | | |
| Construction Noise Alternative A: Construction activities could result in potentially adverse (significant) noise impacts. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | Construction of the proposed project would be in voluntary compliance with the requirements of Sections 112.03 and 41.40 of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code and any variances to the Code issued by the City, which will reduce impacts to not adverse/not significant. | No additional mitigation measures required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Operational Noise Alternative A: Operation of this alternative would result in potentially adverse (significant) noise impacts to a residential loft at 611 Ducommun. Alternative A-1: This alternative is located about 1 block farther north than Alternative A and would not create any noise impacts. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | All Amtrak and Metrolink trains are required to comply with EPA noise standards for locomotives and railroad cars as outlined in 40 CFR Part 201. Note that City of Los Angeles regulations do not apply. | If the Alternative A alignment is selected for implementation, during Final Design a combination of measures, such as noise barriers on the elevated rail structure, and/or sound insulation for the rear side of the building shall be developed. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Less than Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-12 – Railroad Operations (NEPA Only) | | | | |
| Operations and Schedule Both Build Alternatives: Proposed alternatives would improve station operations and schedule reliability. | Beneficial (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Beneficial (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |
| Section 3-13 – Safety and Security (NEPA Only) | | | | |
| Construction Both Build Alternatives: No adverse (significant) safety and security impacts during construction | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | The Contract Documents and the Contractor’s Site-Specific Safety Plan would be used to create a safe working environment for construction employees and to protect the public from harm. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |
| Operation Both Build Alternatives: No long-term adverse (significant) safety and security impacts resulting from operation | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) | Future operations would continue to implement FRA rules and regulations for active track transportation of passengers and rail car/engine safety outlined under CFR, Part 216 to 238. The project would also comply with safety regulations and prevention guidelines established under the Amtrak Emergency Action Plan. Both plans would be revised to meet the emergency needs associated with the addition of a run-through track segment, including a special circumstances section as defined by Title 49 CFR, Part 239. | No additional mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) (CEQA does not apply) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-14 – Population, Housing, and Employment | | | | |
| Residential Displacements Both Build Alternatives: No residential displacements would be required. Thus, no adverse (significant) impact would result. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Business Acquisitions Alternative A: One warehouse, one surface pay parking lot, all or a portion of an automobile impound lot, and all or a portion of a vacant lot would be acquired. The business operations at these would be displaced. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | Purchases would be at fair market value. Relocation assistance would be provided in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, section 6018 of the Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Guidelines (California Code of Regulations), and the provisions of the California Relocation Act (Government Code sections 7260-7277). | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Business Acquisitions Alternative A-1: Two occupied business locations: 801 Commercial Street and all or part of the automobile impound lot at 500 Center Street would be acquired. The business operations at these would be displaced. A vacant lot with no businesses would also be acquired. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | Purchases would be at fair market value. Relocation assistance would be provided in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, section 6018 of the Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Guidelines (California Code of Regulations), and the provisions of the California Relocation Act (Government Code sections 7260-7277). | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Other Impacts Both Build Alternatives: No long-term access disruptions, neighborhood barriers, unplanned growth, or environmental justice impacts would result. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-15 – Traffic and Transportation | | | | |
| Vehicle Round Trips Both Build Alternatives: Future operation reduces over 11,000 vehicle round trips per day trip. | Beneficial (NEPA) Beneficial (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Beneficial (NEPA) Beneficial (CEQA) |
| Study Intersections Both Build Alternatives: Construction and operation would have minimal effect on study intersections in the vicinity. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required. However, consultation with LADOT will occur to develop a Traffic Management Program, to include traffic detour plans for any street or sidewalk closures that would occur during construction | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Bridge Over U.S. 101 Both Build Alternatives: Building the railroad bridge over U.S. 101 could have significant (CEQA) impacts during construction period. Temporary impacts would not be adverse under NEPA. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | TR-1 A Traffic Management Program would be developed in consultation with the California Department of Transportation, to include a plan for limited lane closures and traffic detours for U.S. 101 | Not Adverse (NEPA) Less than Significant (CEQA) |
| Relocation of Mail Operations Both Build Alternatives: Relocating Amtrak's mail and express operations to Redondo Junction would not result in an adverse (significant) impact due to the limited number of trucks affected. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Transportation and Circulation Both Build Alternatives: Positive effect on transportation and circulation at Union Station, with little additional vehicle traffic in the vicinity. | Beneficial (NEPA) Beneficial (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Beneficial (NEPA) Beneficial (CEQA) |
| On-Street Parking Alternative A: No loss of on-street parking. Alternative A-1: Loss of 3 on-street parking spaces on Commercial St. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Section 3-16 – Utility Disruptions and Relocations | | | | |
| Utility Line Relocations Both Build Alternatives: Limited to relocation of lines intersected by the proposed alignments. Service interruptions during the relocations would be temporary and short-term. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Less than Significant (CEQA) | A Utility Relocation Plan would be developed in accordance with policies and practices established by the State, the City of Los Angeles, and the utility companies. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Section 3-17 – Visual Impacts | | | | |
| Visual Resources Both Build Alternatives: No visual resources would be adversely (significantly) affected. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Potential Environmental Impacts for Build Alternatives | Significance Determination | Actions to Reduce Impacts | | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | Regulatory Requirements | Proposed Mitigation Measures | |
| Section 3-18 – Hydrology and Water | | | | |
| Existing Drainage Patterns Both Build Alternatives: Would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns and would not increase flows. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | No regulatory requirements. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| Erosion and Water Quality Both Build Alternatives: Potential temporary increases in erosion and degradation of water quality during construction. | Potentially Adverse (NEPA) Potentially Significant (CEQA) | Clean Water Act. A NPDES General Permit with construction BMPs would be obtained per Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ. A Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water permit with operational BMPs would also be obtained. | No mitigation measures are required | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |
| 100-Year Floodplain Both Build Alternatives: Not within a 100-year floodplain. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) | Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management | No mitigation measures are required. | Not Adverse (NEPA) Not Significant (CEQA) |

ES-5.1 Agency Approvals and Permits

The following agencies may use the EIR/EIS in the event that permits or discretionary approvals from these agencies are required for the proposed project:

California Department of Fish & Game
California Department of Toxic Substances Control
California Department of Transportation
California Public Utilities Commission
California Transportation Commission
City of Los Angeles, all departments and authorities
County of Los Angeles, all departments and authorities
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
South Coast Air Quality Management District
Southern California Regional Rail Authority
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

ES-5.2 Intended Use of an EIR

Under CEQA, the EIR and the information contained herein will be used by the California Department of Transportation, as the Lead Agency, in deciding whether, or under what conditions, to approve the proposed project. The information in this EIR will also be used by other agencies that have a responsibility under CEQA, which may include issues related to this project.

CEQA Responsible Agencies:

California Department of Fish & Game
California Department of Toxic Substances Control
California Public Utilities Commission
California Transportation Commission
City of Los Angeles, all departments and boards
County of Los Angeles, all departments and boards
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
South Coast Air Quality Management District
Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

ES-6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMENT

Please see Chapter 7, Public Outreach, for a complete discussion of public outreach efforts.

ES-6.1 Scoping Meeting Notifications

Notice of the two public Scoping workshops were provided by:

- posting the NOI in the Federal Register
- filing the NOP with the State Clearinghouse and Los Angeles County Clerk
- mailing the NOP to responsible and trustee public agencies
- publishing notices of the Scoping meeting in newspapers of general circulation
- publishing notices of the Scoping meeting in non-English newspapers (Japanese, Spanish and Mandarin Chinese.)
- mailing the NOP to organizations and individuals known or assumed to be interested in the proposed project
- mailing the NOP or Scoping Notice to residents, businesses and institutions in the study area

ES-6.2 Community Meetings

Community meetings have been held to apprise particular interest groups about the proposed project and to provide information on the development of alternatives. Prior to each community meeting, the project team placed newspaper advertisements in the abovementioned newspapers. Advertisements generally ran 2 to 3 weeks prior to the meeting date. Mailings were made to all addresses within the study area, as well as postcard notifications to individuals previously listed in the project database. At each meeting, attendees were added to the project database so that they would receive future notifications. The community meetings included:

- October 9, 2002 – Progress Briefing No. 1. This update meeting presented the project description, purpose and need; an introduction and explanation of the alternative analysis and screening process; information regarding proposed modifications to Los Angeles Union Station; a multimedia modeling presentation; the project schedule; the environmental process description; and information regarding the project’s next steps.
- January 28, 2003 – Little Tokyo Neighborhood Council. This meeting presented the same information as Progress Briefing No. 1.
- January 29, 2003 – Los Angeles River Arts and Business Association. This meeting presented the same information as Progress Briefing No. 1.
- March 5, 2003 – Progress Briefing No. 2. In addition to the newspaper notices, certified letters were sent to those who lived or own property within 5 miles of the project area. Three days prior to the meeting, reminders were sent via electronic mail to those listed in the project database. This meeting presented the results of the screening process; recommended Alignment A; proposed station modifications; preliminary cost estimates for the project; and an overall project timeline. The alignment evaluation matrix was presented, detailing how the screening criteria were applied to result in an alignment recommendation.

- April 9, 2003 – William Mead Homes. Residents of this public housing property were presented the same information as Progress Briefing No. 2.

Website: A project website www.runthroughtracks.org, became available for public access in May 2002. The website has been accessed by the community over 10,000 times.

ES-6.3 Draft EIR/EIS Public Meetings

~~The next round of public meetings will occur during the 45-day circulation period of the Draft EIR/EIS. Notification of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and public information workshops/public hearings will follow the same procedures previously used:~~

- ~~• newspaper advertisements in 4 local newspapers,~~
- ~~• mailings to all parties in the project database, and~~
- ~~• posting of the meeting notice on the project website.~~

~~In addition to placement in area libraries, the DEIS/DEIR will be available for downloading from the project website.~~

~~The public hearing will be held on October 13, 2004, from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the MTA Building, 1 Gateway Plaza, 3rd Floor Conference Room, Los Angeles, CA, 90012.~~

The NEPA public review period began with the publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on Friday, September 10, 2004. The CEQA public review period began with the posting of the Notice of Availability at the Los Angeles County Clerk on September 3, 2004, and the receipt of the Notice of Completion at the State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, on Friday, September 9, 2004.

Newspaper advertisements noticing the public hearing and the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS were published on two separate occasions in the following five newspapers: *Downtown News*, *Rafu Shimpo*, *Chinese Daily News*, *La Opinion*, *Los Angeles Times*. The first printing occurred within all five of the above newspapers between the dates of September 6 and 10, 2004. It announced the proposed project and the beginning of the public review period. The second printing occurred between October 4 and 8, 2004. It reminded the public of the upcoming public hearing.

ES-6.3.1 Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS

Copies of the document were mailed to responsible and trustee agencies and to those who had previously requested a copy of the document. An electronic copy of the document was placed on the project website, www.runthroughtracks.org, and physical copies of the document were placed in the following locations:

- Benjamin Franklin Library, 2200 E. 1st Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90033
- Chinatown Branch Library, 639 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90012

- Los Angeles Public Library Science Department, 630 W. 5th Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90071
- Little Tokyo Library, 244 S. Alameda Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90012
- California Department of Transportation, 120 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Any property owner who would be potentially affected by the proposed project was notified of this via posting of the Notice of Availability at the Los Angeles County Clerk, the newspaper advertising, and the mailing distribution of the Draft EIR/EIS. Personal delivery of the document (by the public outreach consultant) to any businesses that would directly be affected by the proposed project occurred on October 6, 2004. Specifically, four complete sets of documents were hand delivered to the Los Angeles Police Department, Property Division; Viertel's Automotive Service; Mrs. Friday's-Fishing Processors, Inc.; and B & Z Investments, Inc.

All persons on the project mailing list received Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS. The project mailing list was developed over the course of the project and includes persons notified of or responding to scoping, attendees at public information meetings, and those who asked to be added to the mailing list via the project website or other correspondence. (See Table 7-1, Draft EIR/EIS Distribution List, and Table 27-2, Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List.)

ES-6.3.2 Commenting on the Draft EIR/EIS

Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS were accepted via the project website; in writing via fax, email or mail; by phone; and at the public hearing (oral and written). The FRA and the Department held a public hearing near the project location. It was on October 13, 2004, from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the MTA Building, 1 Gateway Plaza, 3rd Floor Conference Room, Los Angeles, CA, 90012.

The close of the comment period was close of business on October 25, 2004.

Comments were submitted in the following manner:

- in writing, mailed to the persons named below;
- in writing at the public hearing;
- to a court reporter at the public hearing;
- via email at the project Internet website, www.runthroughtracks.org;

Comments were addressed to either (or both) of the following persons:

- David Valenstein, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont St. NW, MS-20, Washington, D.C. 20590.
- Gary Iverson, California Department of Transportation District 7, 120 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

All comments received were considered, and responses to substantive comments were addressed in Chapter 12, Comments and Responses. Chapter 11, Clarifications and Modifications, indicates where corresponding edits or corrections to the Draft EIR/EIS were made in response to the comments received.

ES-7 MATTERS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

ES-7.1 Areas of Controversy

Comments received during the course of scoping were focused on:

- How potential alignments would affect individual properties and business operations in the study area.
- How potential alignments would interface with, and avoid conflict with, the MTA Eastside LRT Extension project.

To address these concerns, numerous potential alignments were developed and assessed in an Alternatives Analysis process, as outlined in Section ES-3.1 above.

During the agency and public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS, comments focused on the following issues:

- Determining the impact of the alignment of Alternative A on a site within that alignment that was approved for development subsequent to completion of the analysis reported in the Draft EIR/EIS. This concern was addressed by selection of Alternative A-1 as the Locally Preferred Alternative, since the Alternative A-1 alignment would avoid the property on which construction of the new business was approved by the City of Los Angeles.
- Ensuring the assimilation of proposed changes at Union Station with the operation of the station and the south end of the proposed new “S-curve” tracks into the mainline tracks, respectively. These issues were addressed by the conceptual designs presented in the Draft EIR/EIS. Responses to address specific comments are shown in Chapter 12.
- Clarifying air quality assumptions, impacts, and mitigation measures. These issues were largely addressed in the air quality impact analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS. Responses to address specific comments are shown in Chapter 12. Mitigation measures have been edited to include some of the suggested measures by the commenting agencies. The results of the edited measures do not change the analysis of the significance of impacts after mitigation that was stated in the Draft EIR/EIS: Under CEQA, there would still be significant air quality impacts during the construction period and long term.
- Avoiding impacts to local streets, especially a potential realignment of Commercial Street reported in the Draft EIR/EIS for Alternative A-1. The response to comment in Chapter 12 indicates that the initial design could be refined during subsequent design phases to perhaps avoid the need for realignment. Under the initial design, there was no reported

change in Level of Service (LOS) at nearby street intersections; a potential design revision would also not be expected to result in a change in LOS.

ES-7.2 Issues to Be Resolved

The California Department of Transportation will need to complete the following actions to complete the CEQA process:

1. Issuance of the Final EIR/EIS to all agencies and persons that provided comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.
2. Certification of the EIR
3. Approval of a project, to include (a) consideration of environmental impacts, (b) conditions under which the project is approved, (c) adoption of statements of finding and of overriding considerations, (d) adoption of a mitigation and monitoring reporting programs, and (e) filing Notices of Completion and Notice of Determination. The project to be approved is assumed to be Alternative A-1 or a variation of Alternative A-1.

Other matters to be resolved are:

- (a) identification of funds to refine/complete design for acquisition of property and displacement of businesses and for construction;
- (b) ongoing consultation with Catellus Corporation (owner of Union Station), the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (operator of the commuter rail service within Union Station), Amtrak (operator of the intracity rail service within Union Station), Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (owner of the SCRRA mainline tracks), and the BNSF Railway Company (operator of the freight service over the SCRRA mainline tracks and adjoining tracks) regarding the aforementioned design process; and
- (c) consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer to develop a Memorandum of Agreement to include proposed mitigation measures for archeological resources and ensure that the design process does not have an adverse effect on Union Station .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES-1 BACKGROUND ES-1

ES-2 PURPOSE AND NEED ES-4

ES-3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STATUS ES-5

 ES-3.1 Development of Alternatives ES-5

 ES-3.2 No-Build Alternative ES-11

 ES-3.3 Alternative A ES-11

 ES-3.4 Alternative A-1 ES-12

 ES-3.5 Environmental Process ES-14

 ES-3.6 Next Steps ES-17

ES-4 OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ES-17

 ES-4.1 Summary of Impacts ES-17

 ES-4.2 Summary Table ES-18

ES-5 AGENCY COORDINATION ES-19

 ES-5.1 Agency Approvals and Permits ES-43

 ES-5.2 Intended Use of an EIR ES-43

ES-6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMENT ES-43

 ES-6.1 Scoping Meeting Notifications ES-43

 ES-6.2 Community Meetings ES-44

 ES-6.3 Draft EIR/EIS Public Meetings ES-45

ES-7 MATTERS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA ES-47

 ES-7.1 Areas of Controversy ES-47

 ES-7.2 Issues to Be Resolved ES-48

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE AND NEED

1-1 SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PURPOSE 1-1

1-2 TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS, PROBLEMS, ISSUES AND NEEDS 1-1

 1-2.1 Union Station 1-2

 1-2.2 Constraints on Union Station Operations 1-7

1-3 RELATED PROJECTS THAT AFFECT THE PROPOSED RUN-THROUGH TRACKS PROJECT 1-12

 1-3.1 MTA Eastside LRT Project 1-12

 1-3.2 Roadway Network Projects 1-13

 1-3.3 Freight Rail System 1-15

 1-3.4 El Monte Busway Extension Project 1-15

 1-3.5 High-Speed Rail Project 1-15

 1-3.6 MAGLEV Project 1-16

 1-3.7 LOSSAN Corridor 1-16

 1-3.8 Development Projects 1-16

1-4 PROJECT BACKGROUND 1-17

1-5 STUDY AREA 1-18

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES

2-1 POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES AND SCREENING 2-1

 2-1.1 Initial Screening 2-1

 2-1.2 Second Screening 2-26

 2-1.3 Supplemental Screening 2-38

2-1.4 Screening of Bridge Design Alternatives.....2-46

2-1.5 Candidate Alternatives2-47

2-2 DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS2-48

2-2.1 No-Build Alternative.....2-48

2-2.2 Alternative A.....2-49

2-2.3 Alternative A-12-66

2-3 RELATED PROJECTS THAT AFFECT THE PROPOSED RUN-THROUGH

TRACKS PROJECT2-73

2-3.1 MTA Eastside LRT Project.....2-73

2-3.2 Roadway Network Projects.....2-74

2-3.3 Freight Rail System.....2-75

2-3.4 El Monte Busway Extension Project.....2-76

2-3.5 High-Speed Rail Project.....2-76

2-3.6 MAGLEV Project2-77

2-3.7 Development Projects2-77

CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

3-1 ACQUISITIONS AND DISPLACEMENTS.....3-1.1

3-1.1 Existing Conditions.....3-1.1

3-1.2 Environmental Impacts3-1.1

3-1.3 Potential Mitigation.....3-1.12

3-1.4 Impact Results with Mitigation.....3-1.12

3-2 AIR QUALITY3-2.1

3-2.1 Existing Air Quality and Climate.....3-2.1

3-2.2 Air Quality Impacts.....3-2.4

3-2.3 Potential Mitigation.....3-2.15

3-2.4 Impact Results with Mitigation (CEQA only)3-2.17

3-3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES3-3.1

3-3.1 Existing Conditions.....3-3.1

3-3.2 Environmental Impacts3-3.6

3-3.3 Potential Mitigation.....3-3.10

3-3.4 Impact Results with Mitigation.....3-3.10

3-4 COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES3-4.1

3-4.1 Existing Conditions.....3-4.1

3-4.2 Environmental Impacts3-4.10

3-4.3 Potential Mitigation.....3-4.22

3-4.4 Impact Results with Mitigation.....3-4.23

3-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES3-5.1

3-5.1 Existing Conditions.....3-5.1

3-5.2 Environmental Impacts3-5.36

3-5.3 Potential Mitigation.....3-5.74

3-5.4 Impact Results with Mitigation.....3-5.80

3-5.5 Cumulative Impacts3-5.80

3-6 ENERGY.....3-6.1

3-6.1 Existing Conditions.....3-6.1

3-6.2 Environmental Impacts 3-6.3
3-6.3 Potential Mitigation..... 3-6.7
3-6.4 Impact Results with Mitigation..... 3-6.7

3-7 EXECUTIVE ORDERS..... 3-7.1
3-7.1 Floodplain Management 3-7.1
3-7.2 Protection of Wetlands..... 3-7.1
3-7.3 Environmental Justice 3-7.1
3-7.4 Invasive Species..... 3-7.2

3-8 GEOLOGIC/SEISMIC 3-8.1
3-8.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-8.1
3-8.2 Environmental Impacts 3-8.8
3-8.3 Potential Mitigation..... 3-8.13
3-8.4 Impact Results with Mitigation..... 3-8.14

3-9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 3-9.1
3-9.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-9.1
3-9.2 Environmental Impacts 3-9.10
3-9.3 Potential Mitigation..... 3-9.17
3-9.4 Impact Results with Mitigation..... 3-9.18

3-10 LAND USE AND PLANNING 3-10.1
3-10.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-10.1
3-10.2 Environmental Impacts 3-10.11
3-10.3 Mitigation..... 3-10.20

3-11 NOISE AND VIBRATION 3-11.1
3-11.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-11.1
3-11.2 Environmental Impacts 3-11.8
3-11.3 Potential Mitigation..... 3-11.17
3-11.4 Impact Results with Mitigation..... 3-11.19

3-12 RAILROAD OPERATIONS 3-12.1
3-12.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-12.1
3-12.2 Environmental Impacts 3-12.6
3-12.3 Potential Mitigation..... 3-12.10
3-12.4 Impact Results with Mitigation..... 3-12.10

3-13 SAFETY AND SECURITY..... 3-13.1
3-13.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-13.1
3-13.2 Environmental Impacts 3-13.3
3-13.3 Potential Mitigation..... 3-13.7

3-14 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT 3-14.1
3-14.1 Existing Conditions..... 3-14.1
3-14.2 Environmental Impacts 3-14.9

3-15 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION..... 3-15.1

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 3-15.1 Existing Conditions..... | 3-15.1 |
| 3-15.2 Environmental Impacts | 3-15.9 |
| 3-15.3 Potential Mitigation..... | 3-15.25 |
| 3-16 UTILITY DISRUPTIONS AND RELOCATIONS | 3-16.1 |
| 3-16.1 Existing Conditions..... | 3-16.1 |
| 3-16.2 Environmental Impacts | 3-16.5 |
| 3-16.3 Potential Mitigation..... | 3-16.15 |
| 3-16.4 Impact Results with Mitigation..... | 3-16.15 |
| 3-17 VISUAL IMPACTS | 3-17.1 |
| 3-17.1 Existing Conditions..... | 3-17.1 |
| 3-17.2 Environmental Impacts | 3-17.5 |
| 3-17.3 Potential Mitigation..... | 3-17.43 |
| 3-18 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY | 3-18.1 |
| 3-18.1 Existing Conditions..... | 3-18.1 |
| 3-18.2 Environmental Impacts | 3-18.11 |
| 3-18.3 Potential Mitigation..... | 3-18.18 |
| CHAPTER 4 - OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS | |
| 4-1 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY | 4-1 |
| 4-2 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES | 4-2 |
| 4-3 GROWTH INDUCEMENT | 4-3 |
| 4-4 INDIRECT/SECONDARY IMPACTS..... | 4-4 |
| 4-4.1 Acquisitions and Displacements | 4-4 |
| 4-4.2 Air Quality..... | 4-5 |
| 4-4.3 Biological Resources..... | 4-5 |
| 4-4.4 Community Facilities and Services | 4-5 |
| 4-4.5 Cultural Resources | 4-5 |
| 4-4.6 Energy | 4-5 |
| 4-4.7 Geology/Seismic Hazards | 4-5 |
| 4-4.8 Hazardous Materials..... | 4-6 |
| 4-4.9 Land Use and Planning..... | 4-6 |
| 4-4.10 Noise and Vibration..... | 4-6 |
| 4-4.11 Railroad Operations..... | 4-6 |
| 4-4.12 Safety and Security..... | 4-6 |
| 4-4.13 Population, Housing, and Employment..... | 4-7 |
| 4-4.14 Traffic and Transportation..... | 4-7 |
| 4-4.15 Utilities | 4-7 |
| 4-4.16 Visual Quality/Aesthetics..... | 4-7 |
| 4-4.17 Water Quality and Hydrology | 4-7 |
| 4-5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS | 4-8 |
| 4-5.1 Related Projects..... | 4-9 |
| 4-5.2 Impacts | 4-9 |
| 4-6 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS | 4-21 |
| 4-7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE | 4-21 |
| CHAPTER 5 - AGENCY COORDINATION | |
| 5-1 FEDERAL AGENCIES | 5-1 |

5-2 STATE AGENCIES..... 5-1
 5-2.1. Section 106 Consultation 5-2
5-3 REGIONAL/LOCAL AGENCIES 5-4
5-4 CONSULTATION DURING PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD 5-6
CHAPTER 6 - SECTION 4(f) AND SECTION 6(f) EVALUATION
6-1 APPLICATION OF SECTION 4(f)..... 6-1
 6-1.1 Introduction..... 6-1
 6-1.2 Section 4(f) “Use” 6-2
6-2 PROPOSED ACTION 6-3
6-3 DESCRIPTION OF SECTION 4(f) PROPERTIES 6-3
 6-3.1 Public Parks and Recreation Areas 6-3
 6-3.2 Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges 6-6
 6-3.3 Historic Sites..... 6-6
6-4 IMPACTS TO SECTION 4(f) PROPERTIES..... 6-10
 6-4.1 Historic Properties with No Section 4(f) Use 6-10
 6-4.2 Historic Properties Excluded from Section 4(f)..... 6-14
 6-4.3 Archaeological Sites with Potential Section 4(f) Use 6-27
6-5 SECTION 4(f) COORDINATION/CONSULTATION 6-30
6-6 SECTION 6(f)(3) CONSIDERATIONS..... 6-32

CHAPTER 7 - PUBLIC OUTREACH
7-1 SCOPING FOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS 7-1
 7-1.1. Outreach Effort and Public Participation 7-1
 7-1.2. Meetings..... 7-2
 7-1.3. Public Comment Process 7-3
7-2 SUMMARY OF SCOPING REPORT..... 7-3
 7-2.1. Introduction..... 7-3
 7-2.2. Project Background..... 7-4
 7-2.3. Issues and Questions Raised During the Scoping Period..... 7-8
7-3 FORMAL PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD OF THE DRAFT EIS/EIR..... 7-9
 7-3.1. Commencement and Notification of the Formal Public Review Period of the
 Draft EIS/EIR 7-9
7-4 DISTRIBUTION OF THE FINAL EIS/EIR..... 7-24
7-5 WHAT NEXT? 7-36
 7-5.1. Mitigation Monitoring Program..... 7-36

CHAPTER 8 - LIST OF PREPARERS

CHAPTER 9 - BIBLIOGRAPHY AND OTHER REFERENCES

CHAPTER 10 - AGENCIES, PERSONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

CHAPTER 11 - CLARIFICATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS
 11-1 Introduction..... 11-1
 11-2 Revisions and Clarifications to the DEIR..... 11-1

CHAPTER 12 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
 12-1 Introduction..... 12-1
 12-2 Comments and Responses to Comments 12-1

APPENDICES: [NOT REPRINTED IN FINAL EIR]

- APPENDIX A. CONSULTATION WITH SHPO**
- APPENDIX B. PLAN DRAWINGS**
- APPENDIX C. TECHNICAL REPORTS [PROVIDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER]**

- AIR QUALITY STUDY
- ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDY (HPSR)
- DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM
- NOISE AND VIBRATION STUDY
- PHASE I HAZARDOUS MATERIALS STUDY
- RELATED PROJECTS
- TRAFFIC STUDY
- WATER QUALITY, HYDROLOGY, AND FLOODPLAINS STUDY

LIST OF FIGURES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Figure ES-1: Union Station Vicinity Aerial Overview ES-2
 Figure ES-2: Mission Junction Aerial Overview ES-3
 Figure ES-3: Aerial Alignment Alternatives Across U.S. 101 ES-8
 Figure ES-4: Overall Alignment of Alternative A ES-9
 Figure ES-5: Overall Alignment of Alternative A-1 ES-10
 Figure ES-6: Platform and Track Changes at Union Station ES-13

CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE AND NEED

Figure 1-1: Union Station Vicinity Aerial Overview 1-3
 Figure 1-2: Mission Junction Aerial Overview 1-4
 Figure 1-3: Union Station Tracks and Throat Area 1-5
 Figure 1-4: Track Layout 1-9
 Figure 1-5: Study Areas 1-19

CHAPTER 2: ALTERNATIVES

Figure 2-1: Initial Screening Study Area 2-3
 Figure 2-2: Alternative A 2-27
 Figure 2-3: Alternative B 2-28
 Figure 2-4: Alternative C 2-29
 Figure 2-5: Alternative D 2-31
 Figure 2-6: Alternative A-1 2-41
 Figure 2-7: Alternative A-2 2-42
 Figure 2-8: Alternative A-3 2-43
 Figure 2-9: Alternative A-4 2-44
 Figure 2-10: Overall Alignment of Alternative A 2-50
 Figure 2-11: Modifications to Throat Area and Union Station 2-52
 Figure 2-12: Modifications to Union Station 2-54
 Figure 2-13: Proposed New Platforms, Plan View 2-55
 Figure 2-14: Proposed New Platforms, Cross Section View 2-56
 Figure 2-15: Modifications to Platform Nos. 2 and 3, Plan View 2-58
 Figure 2-16: Modification to Platform Nos. 2 and 3, Cross Section View 2-59
 Figure 2-17: Service and Baggage Road Modifications, Upper Level 2-60
 Figure 2-18: Service and Baggage Road Modifications, Lower Level 2-61
 Figure 2-19: Service and Baggage Road, Cross Section View 2-62
 Figure 2-20: Segment 2 of Alternative A 2-64
 Figure 2-21: Segment 3 of Alternative A 2-65
 Figure 2-22: Location of New Mail Facility 2-67
 Figure 2-23: Overall Alignment of Alternative A-1 2-68
 Figure 2-24: Segment 2 of Alternative A-1 2-70
 Figure 2-25: Segment 3 of Alternative A-1 2-71
 Figure 2-26: MTA Portal 2-72

CHAPTER 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

3-1 ACQUISITIONS AND DISPLACEMENTS

Figure 3-1.1: Parcels to Be Acquired for Alignment A 3-1.6
 Figure 3-1.2: Parcels to Be Acquired for Alternative A-1 3-1.10

3-2 AIR QUALITY

3-3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3-4 COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Figure 3-4.1: Community Services and Facilities..... 3-4.3

3-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Figure 3-5.1: Area of Potential Effects Map..... 3-5.4
 Figure 3-5.2: APE Addendum 3-5.5
 Figure 3-5.3: Union Station 3-5.22
 Figure 3-5.4: Terminal Tower 3-5.24
 Figure 3-5.5: Macy Street Undercrossing..... 3-5.25
 Figure 3-5.6: Vignes Street Undercrossing..... 3-5.27
 Figure 3-5.7: Car Supply/Repair Shop..... 3-5.28
 Figure 3-5.8: 1st Street Viaduct 3-5.30
 Figure 3-5.9: AT&SF Offices 3-5.31
 Figure 3-5.10: Mission Tower 3-5.32
 Figure 3-5.11: U.S. 101 Bridge 3-5.34
 Figure 3-5.12: Aerial Comparison 3-5.51
 Figure 3-5.13: El Monte Busway 1987..... 3-5.52
 Figure 3-5.14: MTA Red Line 1989-90..... 3-5.53
 Figure 3-5.15: Ramp to Platform No. 3 After Red Line Construction 3-5.56
 Figure 3-5.16: Red Line Excavation, 1991 3-5.57
 Figure 3-5.17: Additional Projects..... 3-5.59
 Figure 3-5.18: Remaining Historic Fabric 3-5.61
 Figure 3-5.19: Red Line Excavation – Platform View 3-5.63
 Figure 3-5.20: Canopy Plan, 1939 3-5.67
 Figure 3-5.21: Canopy Plan, 2003 3-5.68
 Figure 3-5.22: Historic Plan for Double End or Through Terminal 3-5.70

3-6 ENERGY

3-7 EXECUTIVE ORDERS

3-8 GEOLOGIC/SEISMIC

Figure 3-8.1: Acceleration Coefficient vs. Earthquake Return Period..... 3-8.6

3-9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Figure 3-9.1: Listed Sites of Concern..... 3-9.5

3-10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Figure 3-10.1: Existing Land Use 3-10.2
 Figure 3-10.2: Community and District Plans 3-10.4
 Figure 3-10.3: CRA Redevelopment Areas 3-10.10

3-11 NOISE AND VIBRATION

Figure 3-11.1: Examples of Typical Outdoor Noise Exposure..... 3-11.2
 Figure 3-11.2: Noise Measurement Locations..... 3-11.4
 Figure 3-11.3: Typical Groundborne Vibration Levels and Criteria 3-11.6
 Figure 3-11.4: Vibration Measurement Locations 3-11.7

3-12 RAILROAD OPERATIONS

3-13 SAFETY AND SECURITY

3-14 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

Figure 3-14.1: Population, Housing, and Employment Study Area 3-14.2
 Figure 3-14.2: Locations of Known Residential Units 3-14.7

3-15 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Figure 3-15.1: Traffic Study Area..... 3-15.4
 Figure 3-15.2: Existing (2003) AM and PM Peak Hour Volume 3-15.5
 Figure 3-15.3: Year 2010 Cumulative Base AM and PM Peak Hour Volume 3-15.12
 Figure 3-15.4: Year 2025 Cumulative Base AM and PM Peak Hour Volume 3-15.13
 Figure 3-15.5: Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project Construction AM and PM Peak Hour Volume. 3-15.14
 Figure 3-15.6: Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project AM and PM Peak Hour Volume..... 3-15.15
 Figure 3-15.7: Year 2025 Cumulative Plus Project AM and PM Peak Hour Volume..... 3-15.16

3-16 UTILITY DISTRUPTIONS AND RELOCATIONS

Figure 3-16.1: Impacts to Existing Utilities – Alternative A 3-16.7
 Figure 3-16.2: Impacts to Existing Utilities – Alternative A-1 3-16.12

3-17 VISUAL IMPACTS

Figure 3-17.1: Birdseye View NE – Station Stub-End 3-17.2
 Figure 3-17.2: View East – Proposed U.S. 101 Bridge Location 3-17.3
 Figure 3-17.3: U.S. 101, View West – Busway/MWD Adjoining 3-17.7
 Figure 3-17.4: View West, Downtown – From 1st Street Bridge..... 3-17.8
 Figure 3-17.5: U.S. 101 – View West circa 1930 3-17.9
 Figure 3-17.6: Landscape Units 3-17.11
 Figure 3-17.7: Union Station Terminal – Looking North 3-17.13
 Figure 3-17.8: Union Station South Courtyard – View East, MWD Adjoining 3-17.14
 Figure 3-17.9: View SE from Old Baggage/Mail Building Parking Lot to Platform Area 3-17.15
 Figure 3-17.10: Landscape Unit B, Platform 2 – Looking NW 3-17.16
 Figure 3-17.11: Landscape Unit B – View N to Throat Area, Gold Line Ramp/Tracks 3-17.17
 Figure 3-17.12: Landscape Unit B, Platforms 2 and 3 – Looking North..... 3-17.19
 Figure 3-17.13: Landscape Unit B, Platform 2 – Looking SW to Stub-End 3-17.20
 Figure 3-17.14: Landscape Unit C – Looking East to New Bridge Location..... 3-17.21
 Figure 3-17.15: Landscape Unit C – Looking West to New Bridge Location..... 3-17.22
 Figure 3-17.16: Landscape Unit C, Commercial and Hewitt Streets – View East 3-17.23
 Figure 3-17.17: Landscape Unit C, Ducommun and Vignes Streets – View East..... 3-17.24
 Figure 3-17.18: Landscape Unit C – View North to Run-Through Location 3-17.25
 Figure 3-17.19: Landscape Unit C – View North to Vignes Street 3-17.26
 Figure 3-17.20: Landscape Unit D, BNSF Mainline from 1st Street Bridge..... 3-17.28
 Figure 3-17.21: Mail Facility Relocation Site – Looking South..... 3-17.29
 Figure 3-17.22: Mail Facility Relocation Site – Looking North..... 3-17.30
 Figure 3-17.23: Simulated Redesigned Platform at New Platform Height – View North..... 3-17.36
 Figure 3-17.24: Simulated Bridge over U.S. 101 – Looking East 3-17.37
 Figure 3-17.25: U.S. 101 – View East from Hill Street..... 3-17.38
 Figure 3-17.26: Simulated Trestle – View East on Commercial Street..... 3-17.40
 Figure 3-17.27: Simulated MSE Ramp – View NW from 1st Street Bridge..... 3-17.41

3-18 WATER QUALITY AND HYDROLOGY

Figure 3-18.1: Project Area Floodplain Map3-18.8
Figure 3-18.2: Existing and Proposed Storm Drains3-18.9

CHAPTER 6 - SECTION 4(f) AND SECTION 6(f) EVALUATION

Figure 6-1: Project Location6-4
Figure 6-2: Location of Section 4(f) Public Parks/Recreation Areas.....6-5
Figure 6-3a: Location of Section 4(f) Significant Historic Sites6-8
Figure 6-3b: Location of Section 4(f) Significant Historic Sites6-9

LIST OF TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table ES-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures ES-20

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE AND NEED

CHAPTER 2 – ALTERNATIVES

Table 2-1: Initial Screening 2-4
Table 2-2: Results of Initial Screening 2-24
Table 2-3: Alternative Evaluation Matrix 2-37
Table 2-4: Supplemental Evaluation of Alternatives 2-45
Table 2-5: Bridge Type Selection by Section 2-47

CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

3-1 ACQUISITIONS AND DISPLACEMENTS

Table 3-1.1: Alternative A Affected Properties 3-4
Table 3-1.2: Alternative A-1 Affected Properties 3-8

3-2 AIR QUALITY

Table 3-2.1: Summary of California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards..... 3-2
Table 3-2.2: Comparison of Past 3 Years Air Quality Measurements Near the Project Site with
Ambient Air Quality: Standards 3-3
Table 3-2.3: Summary of Emission Factor References for Each Type of Emission Source 3-5
Table 3-2.4: SCAQMD-Established Thresholds of Air Quality Significance for
Operation and Construction of a Proposed Project 3-6
Table 3-2.5: Comparison of Estimated Emission Impacts and Significance
Thresholds During Construction of Alternative A 3-7
Table 3-2.6: No-Build Alternative – Estimated Emissions..... 3-9
Table 3-2.7: Alternatives A & A-1 Estimated Emissions 3-9
Table 3-2.8: Build vs. No-Build Alternative Comparison 3-10
Table 3-2.9: Existing vs. Build vs. No-Build Alternative Comparison 3-17

3-3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3-4 COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Table 3-4.1: Inventory of Community Services and Facilities 3-1
Table 3-4.2: Inventory of Fire Stations Operating in the Vicinity of Union Station 3-5
Table 3-4.3: LAUSD K-12 Enrollment, FY 2000-2001 and FY 2001–2002 3-7

3-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3-6 ENERGY

3-7 EXECUTIVE ORDERS

3-8 GEOLOGIC/SEISMIC

Table 3-8.1: Major Fault Characterization in the Project Vicinity 3-4

3-9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Table 3-9.1: Primary Database Listed Sites.....3-3
Table 3-9.2: Environmental Risk Distribution Summary (Positive Hits)
Site Location: Los Angeles Union Station, Los Angeles, California 900123-6

3-10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Table 3-10.1 Project Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies.....3-15

3-11 NOISE AND VIBRATION

Table 3-11.1: Noise Measurement Locations3-3
Table 3-11.2: Projected Trains Using the Run-Through Tracks in 2025.....3-8
Table 3-11.3: FTA Noise Impact Criteria3-10
Table 3-11.4: Cumulative Noise Increase Allowed by FTA Criteria3-11
Table 3-11.5: FTA Ground-Borne Vibration and Noise Impact Criteria.....3-12
Table 3-11.6: FTA Vibration Impact Criteria for Special Buildings3-12
Table 3-11.7: Noise Impact Assessment for Alternative A3-14
Table 3-11.8: Vibration Impact Assessment for Alternative A3-15
Table 3-11.9: Noise Impact Assessment for Alternative A-13-16
Table 3-11.10: Vibration Impact Assessment.....3-16

3-12 RAILROAD OPERATIONS

3-13 SAFETY AND SECURITY

3-14 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

Table 3-14.1: Existing Regional and Local Population Characteristics – Race/Ethnicity (2000)3-3
Table 3-14. 2: Existing Regional and Local Population Characteristics – Age/Income (2000)3-3
Table 3-14.3: Existing Regional and Local Housing Characteristics - Size (2000)3-5
Table 3-14.4: Existing Regional and Local Housing Characteristics – Occupancy (2000).....3-5
Table 3-14.5: Existing Regional and Local Housing Characteristics - Tenure (2000).....3-5
Table 3-14.6: Group Quarters Characteristics (2000).....3-6
Table 3-14.7: Draft Population Projections (2015 and 2030).....3-8
Table 3-14.8: Draft Household Projections (2015 and 2030).....3-9
Table 3-14.9: Draft Employment Projections (2015 and 2030).....3-9

3-15 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Table 3-15.1: Existing Surface Street Characteristics in Segment 3.....3-2
Table 3-15.2: Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections.....3-6
Table 3-15.3: Level of Service Definitions for Stop-Controlled Intersections3-6
Table 3-15.4: Existing Intersection Level of Service.....3-7
Table 3-15.5: Level of Service Definitions for Freeway Mainline Segments3-8
Table 3-15.6: Existing Freeway Mainline Level of Service3-8
Table 3-15.7: Future Freeway Mainline Level of Service3-10
Table 3-15.8: Intersection Level of Service Analysis.....3-18
Table 3-15.9: Existing On-Street Parking.....3-24

3-16 UTILITY DISTURPTIONS AND RELOCATIONS

Table 3-16.1: List of Utility Agencies/Companies3-2
Table 3-16.2: List of Impacted Utilities – Alternative A3-8
Table 3-16.3: List of Utility Impacts – Alternative A-13-11

3-17 VISUAL IMPACTS

3-18 WATER QUALITY AND HYDROLOGY

CHAPTER 6 – SECTION 4(f) AND SECTION 6(f) EVALUATION

Table 6-1: Description of Section 4(f) Properties – Public Parks/Recreation Areas6-6
Table 6-2: Description of Section 4(f) Properties – Significant Historic Sites 6-7
Table 6-3: Effects on Section 4(f) Properties – Significant Historic Sites.....6-10

CHAPTER 7 – SECTION 4(f) AND SECTION 6(f) EVALUATION

Table 7-1: Draft EIR/EIS Document Distribution List7-11
Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List.....7-14
Table 7-3: Final EIR/EIS Document Distribution List7-24
Table 7-4: Final EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List.....7-26

APPENDIX C
[NOT REPRINTED IN FINAL EIR]

The technical reports listed below, which were used in preparation of this draft environmental impact report/draft environmental impact statement, are bound separately and are available at:

California Department of Transportation, District 7
120 Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

AIR QUALITY STUDY
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDY (HPSR)
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM
NOISE AND VIBRATION STUDY
PHASE I HAZARDOUS MATERIALS STUDY
RELATED PROJECTS
TRAFFIC STUDY
WATER QUALITY, HYDROLOGY, AND FLOODPLAINS STUDY

Preface

The Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Final Environmental Impact Statement and Report (FEIS/R) is composed of three volumes:

- Volume 1: Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Draft Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (including Appendix A&B), (previously released in September 2004);
- Volume 2: Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Draft Environmental Impact Report and Statement: Technical Appendices (Appendix C–K) (previously released in September 2004); and
- Volume 3: Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Final Environmental Impact Statement and Report (released in fall 2005).

The new Volume 3 consists of an edited reprint of the entire text of the original Volume 1, plus two additional chapters: Clarifications and Modifications (Chapter 11) and Comments and Responses (Chapter 12). Any changes that were made to the document as a result of comments received, errors, omissions, editorial decisions, and/or new information received since the Draft EIR/EIS was released on September 3, 2004, are noted in Chapter 11, Clarifications and Modifications. Chapter 11 thus provides a summary of the changes and a guide as to where the changes occurred. The specific changes are shown in the Final EIR/EIS as underlined text (indicating added information) or ~~strikeout text~~ (indicating deletions), indicating language changes to the Draft EIR/EIS. The locations of changes made since the Draft EIR/EIS was released are further highlighted by vertical bars in the margin. Chapter 11 includes additional technical appendices (not previously included in Volume 2) that are referenced in comments. Volume 2, Technical Reports, was not reprinted at the release of the FEIS/R but is available upon request by contacting:

David Valenstein
Federal Railroad Administration
1120 Vermont St. NW, MS-20
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 493-6368

Gary Iverson
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 Main Street Suite 100, MS 16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606
(213) 897-3656

Finally, a preferred alternative has been identified by the Department and has been incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS (a discussion of a preferred alternative was not present in the Draft EIR/EIS). Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Alternative A-1 is the preferred alternative.

This important information about Alignments A and A-1 is reported in the Executive Summary and in Chapter 2-1.5, Candidate Alternatives, Chapter 2-2, Detailed Description of Alternatives, and at the beginning of Chapter 3. However, within Chapter 3, only the discussion of acquisitions (Chapter 3-2, Acquisitions and Displacements) was edited to reflect this change. Other sections of Chapter 3 were not edited, as the introduction of the new two-story warehouse and office building is not a critical factor in assessing the effects or impacts to other environmental topics reported in the chapter.

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
AND SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION
for the
Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project**

Submitted pursuant to the
California Environmental Quality Act
by the

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
(SCH No. 2002061071)

and

Submitted pursuant to the
National Environmental Policy Act and
42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), 49 U.S.C. 303, and 64 Fed. Reg. 28545
by the

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


Federal Railroad Administration

In cooperation with the


Federal Transit Administration

and

National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak)


Joseph A. Boardman
Administrator
Federal Railroad Administration

Date: NOV 9, 2005


Ron Kosinski
Deputy Director, District 7
California Department of Transportation

Date: October 26, 2005

For additional information concerning this document contact:

David Valenstein
Federal Railroad Administration
1120 Vermont St. NW, MS-20
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 493-6368

Gary Iverson
California Department of Transportation, District 7
100 Main Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606
(213) 897-3656

Abstract: This document describes and summarizes the environmental impacts associated with the California Department of Transportation's proposal to construct run-through tracks that would extend four of the platform tracks at LA Union Station, connect them to the southbound main line and make other track and platform improvements at the station. Two run-through tracks alternatives are considered in addition to No Project. The project would address the need to improve the efficiency and reliability of trains using LA Union Station, improve pedestrian access and connectivity, and increase the capacity of LA Union Station to accommodate future increases in the number of trains. Potential significant impacts to air quality are identified under CEQA; no significant environmental impacts are identified under NEPA.

CHAPTER 8 - LIST OF PREPARERS

Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc. (EIR Preparation and Management)

Myra L. Frank, Principal-in-Charge

M.A. Advanced Studies in Government – Urban Government. 28 years experience in environmental, transportation, and urban planning.

J. Steven Brooks, Senior Project Manager

B. Environmental Design. 28 years experience in environmental, transportation, and urban planning.

Gary Petersen, Senior Project Manager

M.Pl. Urban and Regional Planning. 28 years experience in environmental, transportation, infrastructure, and urban planning.

Lee Lisecki, Project Manager

Masters Transportation Planning. 19 years experience in environmental, transportation, and urban planning.

Rick Starzak, Senior Architectural Historian

M.A. Architecture: History, Criticism & Analysis. 19 years experience in CEQA, Section 4(f) and Section 106 analysis.

Jack C. Ottaway III, Project Manager

Juris Doctor (Candidate). 11 years experience in environmental and urban planning

Louis Utsumi, Project Manager

B.S. Biological Sciences. 14 year experience in environmental, infrastructure, and urban planning.

Linda Weston, Document Manager

Sc.B. Engineering & Applied Science – Environmental Engineering Applications. 16 years experience in document management and technical editing for environmental documents.

Environmental Specialists:

Carson Anderson, Architectural Historian III

M.A Architectural History and Preservation Studies. 20 years experience in design review, community planning, environmental review, and architectural and historic resource inventory and evaluation work.

Gwynneth Doyle, Environmental Planner I

B.A., Urban Studies and Planning. 3 years of experience

Tracy Dudman, Environmental Planner I

M.A., Geography (Candidate). 7 years experience

John English, Architectural Historian II

6 years experience

Elizabeth John, Environmental Planner I

B.A., Geology. 1 year experience

Jennifer Hales, Environmental Planner I

B.A., Public Policy Management & Planning. 1 year experience

Ky Lain, Planning Assistant

Ph.D. (Candidate), American Culture Studies. 10 years experience

Ksta Kne, Environmental Planner II
Juris Doctor. 5 years experience
Susan Steed, Environmental Planner I
B.A., Geography. 1 year experience

HDR, Inc. (Air Quality, Biology, Energy, Hazardous Materials, Railroad Operations, Utilities, Hydrology and Water Quality; Project Engineering)

JoAnn Hadfield, Environmental and Resource Management Section Manager
Bachelor of Science, Urban Planning/Geography. 24 years of experience
Carl A. Moczydlowsky, GIS Analyst
Bachelor of Arts, Environmental Studies. 7 years experience
David R. Meyer, Senior Project Manager
Master of Science, Environmental Policy and Management 23 years of experience
Jeroen Olthof, Project Engineer
Master of Science, Civil Engineering. 7 years experience
Donna KEto, Senior Environmental Specialist
Bachelor of Science, Biological Sciences/Marine Sciences. 24 years of experience
Richard L. Grogan, Project Design Architect
Bachelor of Architecture. 14 years experience
David T. Dettloff, GIS Technician
Bachelor of Arts, Geography/Cartography/Economics 3 years experience
Hugo Bermudez, Environmental Scientist
Bachelor of Science, Environmental Engineering. 8 years experience
David F. LeCureux, Environmental & Resource Management Section Manager
Master of Science, Civil Engineering. 11 years experience
Edward J. Liebsch, Environmental Specialist
Master of Science, Meteorology. 25 years experience
Chandra Taylor-Hodge, Environmental Engineer
Bachelor of Science, Mechanical Engineering. 13 years experience

Kaku Associates, Inc. (Traffic and Transportation)

Paul C. Taylor, P.E., Vice President
M.S. Civil Engineering 31 years experience in transportation planning and engineering.
Ayelet Ezran, Associate
M.S. Civil Engineering. 5 years experience in transportation planning and traffic impact analysis.
Elaine Cheng, Associate
B.S. Civil Engineering. 4 years experience in transportation engineering.

Diaz-Yourman & Associates (Geology)

V. R. Nadeswaran, Associate Engineer, P.E., G.E.
14 years experience in geotechnical investigation.

Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. (Noise and Vibration)

Lance D. Meister, Senior Consultant

B.S. Civil Engineering. 8 years experience in noise and vibration impact assessments.

Jason D. Volk, Consultant

B.S. Mechanical Engineering. 3 years experience in noise and vibration impact assessment.

Gregory M. Barr, Consultant

B.S. Mechanical Engineering. 1 year experience in noise and vibration impact assessments.

CHAPTER 7 - PUBLIC OUTREACH

This chapter addresses the public outreach effort through the entire length of the environmental analysis portion of the proposed project. It begins with the Alternative Analysis phase in which there were 48 initial design concepts. It ends with the documentation of the NEPA and CEQA public review period for the Draft EIS/EIR. Two Alternatives, A and A-1, in addition to the No Build Alternative were carried through to this phase. Although there are periods of formal public comment solicitation, any and all communications with stakeholders throughout the life of the proposed project are considered public outreach.

7-1 SCOPING FOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the public outreach effort during the Alternative Analysis and scoping process of the proposed project conducted by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Amtrak, and State of California Department of Transportation (Department).

The purpose of the Alternatives Analysis process was to identify engineering design constraints and environmental impacts that could render the proposed project difficult to complete. In addition, impacts to other transportation projects and public agencies' properties in the area were identified and considered.

The public outreach effort for the Alternative Analysis process was held simultaneously during the CEQA and NEPA scoping process. The June 24, 2002, meeting was designated as the official scoping meeting; however, all public outreach during this time was considered scoping. The scoping process is summarized in Section 7.2 below. The full scoping report, *Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project, Scoping Report*, is available upon request.

7-1.1. Outreach Effort & Public Participation

The location of the project area posed a few challenges for the community outreach component. The project area is located close to the Chinatown and Little Tokyo neighborhoods, light-industrial manufacturing facilities, a growing loft-apartment community, and a low-income housing complex and adjacent to the Los Angeles River. This economically and ethnically diverse project area compelled the project team to utilize a multimedia approach to ensure that the community was aware of the proposed project and was included in the environmental impact analysis. The outreach to the community included participating in neighborhood and business association meetings, briefing elected officials, and developing a community-friendly website. To distribute information about upcoming meetings, we used the project website, electronic and postal mail announcements, and multi-lingual newspaper advertisements.

The stakeholder database was developed by researching the project area and recording names and addresses of businesses and individuals living in, and elected officials representing, the area. The database was enhanced after each meeting, presentation, and briefing to include those participants who left their name, mailing address, and electronic mail (email) address contact

information with the project team. Information was also gathered from those who entered their contact information on the project website.

For each public meeting, approximately 900 announcements and invitations were distributed approximately 3 weeks prior to the meeting via postal mail. Landowners in the area received letters sent by registered mail to inform them about the project, the project area, and contact procedures should they have additional questions. Letters and invitations were sent to impacted local, state, and federal agencies; elected officials; and those who left their contact information with the project team. The project team also utilized the Internet to send out electronic mail announcements and invitations. For each public meeting we sent out two emails to the approximately 200 email addresses, each publicizing the same information contained in the postal mail.

Prior to each community meeting, the project team placed newspaper advertisements in the *Los Angeles Downtown News*, *La Opinion*, *Rafu Shimpo*, and the *Chinese Daily News*. Advertisements generally ran 2–3 weeks prior to the meeting date. Copies of the advertisements are located in the Scoping Report.

The project website, www.runthroughtracks.org, became available for public access in May 2002. The project website has become a shining example for how the Internet can be utilized to encourage community participation, address immediate concerns, and solicit focused feedback from key project stakeholders. It includes web pages titled Project Overview, EIR Process, Calendar, Your Comments, Mailing List, Publications, Presentations, and Contact Us. The website is updated as new information becomes available. Those utilizing the website have been able to learn about the proposed project, the environmental process, and upcoming project meetings. Participation has been encouraged through the “Your Comments” tab, “Mailing List” tab, and “Publications” tab (Frequently Asked Questions). All comments submitted have been responded to either directly, fulfilling the request, or placing the answer on the Frequently Asked Questions list.

The website has been accessed by the community more than 10,000 times.

At the public meetings all of the materials were available in Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, and English. Also, simultaneous interpretation services were available for the community to utilize.

7-1.2. Meetings

The following meetings have been held with the general public:

Scoping Meeting, June 24, 2002;

City of Los Angeles, Technical Briefing August 20, 2002;

Boyle Heights Youth Opportunity Center, Ed Hernandez, Facilities Director, October 2002;

Progress Briefing #1, October 9, 2002, Update Meeting;

Little Tokyo Neighborhood Council Meeting, January 28, 2003;

Los Angeles River Arts and Business Association, January 29, 2003;

Progress Briefing #2, March 5, 2003; and

William Mead Homes Residents Association Committee, April 9, 2003.

7-1.3. Public Comment Process

Public comments were gathered and recorded through a variety of means throughout the entire scoping process. They will continue to be accepted and reviewed through the length of the proposed project. These include contact information (including phone numbers) provided in ads, handouts, and the website; public comment forms provided at the scoping meeting; and submission via the project website. Comments were responded to via the Frequently Asked Questions section of the project website.

7-2 SUMMARY OF SCOPING REPORT

The main body of the scoping process is contained below, while the full report, *Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks, Scoping Report*, is available upon request.

7-2.1. Introduction

7-2.1.1 Objective

The objective of the Scoping Report is to document the lead agencies' compliance with the scoping requirement of both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 USC 4321 et seq.), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Cal. Pub. Res. Code sec. 21000 et seq.)

According to the Council on Environmental Quality NEPA Regulations (40 CFR Part 1500 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CA. Code of Regulations, Sections 15082–15083), the federal and state lead agencies should use a public scoping process to help define the appropriate range of issues and the depth and breadth of analysis to be addressed in the environmental document. In addition, the scoping process should provide an opportunity for interested parties to identify and eliminate those environmental issues that are determined not to be significant.

As a part of the scoping process, the lead agencies should: (1) invite the participation of affected parties, (2) determine significant issues to be analyzed in the environmental document, and (3) identify and eliminate those environmental issues that are determined not to be significant. This report documents the first requirement and summarizes the issues raised by persons and affected parties commenting during the scoping period. The second and third requirements are implemented as part of the environmental analysis and documentation.

Additionally, in keeping with the spirit of the purpose of scoping in NEPA and CEQA, the project team has established a website as a means to make the public participation process as accessible to as many people as possible. The project Internet website address is <http://www.runthroughtracks.org>. The website contains all pertinent information for the public including, but not limited to, contact information for the lead agencies' project managers, project description, an explanation of the environmental process, an opportunity to submit public comment for the record, scoping meeting materials, and an option to sign-up on the mailing list. As information items and documents are developed over the course of the study, they will be posted on the website. Persons and agencies on the project's electronic mailing list will receive notice when new items are posted.

7-2.2. Project Background

Per Department procedures, a project study report (Project Study Report: To Construct Run-Through Tracks Across U.S. 101 from Los Angeles Union Station to Mainline Track Along the Los Angeles River) was prepared in June 2000 by HDR Engineering, Inc. This report documented the results of an initial planning study to improve train operations at the Los Angeles Union Station Passenger Terminal (LAUS). Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) is a multi-transit facility that serves Amtrak inter-city trains and Southern California Regional Rail Authority intra-city (Metrolink) trains. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) operates a subway system beneath Union Station, as well as a bus transfer facility on adjoining properties.

The purpose of the project study report (PSR) was to identify alternative alignments for the construction of "run-through" tracks to improve the operational efficiency of the passenger station. Run-through tracks would eliminate the need for trains to reverse direction in order to exit Union Station and would instead allow run-through of trains on some tracks. The operational efficiencies gained with the implementation of run-through tracks would result in reduced delay and improved run-times, making inter-city and commuter rail service a more competitive mode of transportation for inter-city travel. The PSR demonstrated the basic feasibility and benefits of constructing a run-through track. Subsequently, a more detailed study entitled the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project was authorized by the Department, in cooperation with Amtrak and the FRA. (For more detail on the project description and location, please see Appendix A, Notice of Intent (NOI), and Appendix B, Notice of Preparation (NOP) and CEQA Initial Study (IS) Checklist.)

A joint CEQA/NEPA document, an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), is being prepared for the proposed project. The Department is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project to address the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.). Environmental staff members from Department District 7 (Los Angeles) are overseeing the environmental process on behalf of the department. Department Rail Program staff (Sacramento) are overseeing the development and analysis of proposed physical and operational changes. The FRA is the lead agency for the evaluation of environmental impacts under NEPA, as amended (42 USC 4321, et seq.). FRA is overseeing the preparation of the EIS components of the joint EIR/EIS document.

7-2.2.1 Scoping Process and Activities

The activities that began the scoping process centered on informing the public and potentially affected public agencies. This was accomplished through the following steps: (1) publishing an NOI in the Federal Register to meet NEPA requirements and posting the NOP with the Los Angeles County Clerk/Recorder to meet CEQA requirements; (2) placement of the notices in newspapers of general circulation; (3) mailing the NOP, along with the CEQA IS Checklist, to potentially affected government agencies, residents, and businesses; (4) translation of key documents from English to three additional languages; and (5) the development and implementation of the project website to further facilitate the transmittal of information.

The next activity was to hold meetings with potentially affected and/or interested parties in the project. The remaining activity was to record the scoping activities, comments, concerns, and issues raised as a result of the meetings as well as to disseminate this information appropriately. This report documents all of the aforementioned steps. Additionally, responses to the comments and issues raised will be addressed either by incorporation into the environmental analysis process or the EIR/EIS.

The project website presents an alternative venue to attending meetings for community participation. As this study moves forward, the project team continues to investigate new methods to increase community participation and to educate the public about the environmental review process. Specific to this project, stakeholders were invited to submit comments via the internet and email. Though the environmental process and scoping comment period information was posted on the website, the public did not state whether it was their intention to comment specifically about scoping matters or whether they were commenting on the project in general. Thus, a procedure was developed in order to facilitate a better understanding of the environmental process.

This procedure is as follows: as individuals contribute via email, they are sent a return email acknowledging their submission and providing an answer (if available) or an indication of when their issue will be addressed (for instance, in the EIR/EIS). From the emails, a Frequently Asked Questions section was created and placed on the website. This process not only acknowledges individuals who made comments but also shares information on issues of common concern.

Emails are tracked in the same manner as written submittals so that all comments and responses are part of the project's public record. Where submitted comments were not directly related to the project, they have been forwarded to the appropriate public agency.

a. Commencement of the Scoping Period

The NEPA public comment and scoping period for the proposed project commenced on June 12, 2002, with the publication of the NOI to prepare an EIS by the FRA in the Federal Register on Wednesday, June 18, 2002 (FR 41749, Vol. 67, No. 118.). The NEPA scoping period closed on July 29, 2002.

The NOI announced the FRA's intent to prepare an EIS in accordance with NEPA. This provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping

meetings. The NOI also included information on the project background, study area, potential alternatives, probable effects to be studied, FRA procedures, relevant scoping meeting information, and contact information. A copy of the NOI is provided in Appendix A.

An NOP for an EIR was mailed by Department District 7 on June 18, 2002, to the State Clearinghouse and to a project-specific mailing list. The NOP announced the Department's intent to prepare an EIR pursuant to the CEQA. Like the NOI, it provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the public scoping meetings and commenced the CEQA scoping period. The NOI also advised California agencies of their obligation to comment on the proposed project within 30 days. The CEQA scoping period closed on July 22, 2002, thirty days after the official posting date. The NOP also included information on the proposed project, alternatives, anticipated effects, scoping meeting information, and contact information. The NOP included a preview of anticipated project impacts via a CEQA IS Checklist. The IS outlines 16 environmental topics considered under CEQA. A copy of the NOP package is provided in Appendix B.

b. Mailings

The NOP was mailed on June 18, 2002. The NOP mailing list included elected officials, government agencies, neighborhood associations, business groups, property owners, and additional stakeholders identified from previous transit studies. The organization names, departments, persons, and titles appear in Appendix F. The actual mailing list is available upon request.

A one-page scoping notice was also prepared, which summarized the proposed project and announced the time and location of the public scoping meeting on June 24, 2002. The scoping notice (Appendix E) was mailed to 1508 businesses, churches, organizations, property owners, and residents within the study area on June 13, 2002. The study area is generally bounded by the Los Angeles River on the east, First Street on the south, Alameda Street on the west, and Main and Leroy Streets on the north.

c. Public Notices

Five newspaper notices were placed announcing the scoping meetings. All notices included the information about the scoping meetings, a project map, and contact information. The newspapers were chosen for their circulation and audience. For example, the *Los Angeles Downtown News* is distributed throughout central and downtown Los Angeles. The *Rafu Shimpo* newspaper serves the cultural Japanese and the community of Little Tokyo. The *Chinese Daily News* serves the cultural Chinese population and Chinatown. *La Opinion* newspaper is circulated to the Latino audience of Los Angeles.

Additionally, the notices were published in four different languages, (i.e., English, Japanese, Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese.) An English language notice was placed in the *Los Angeles Downtown News*, on June 17, 2002. Two notices, one in English, the other in Japanese, were placed in the *Rafu Shimpo* newspaper in the June 15, 2002 edition. In the *Chinese Daily News*, a Mandarin Chinese language notice was placed and ran in the June 13, 2002, edition. On June 15, 2002, a Spanish-language notice was run in *La Opinion*.

Notice of the two public scoping workshops were provided by:

- posting the NOI in the Federal Register;
- filing the NOP with the State Clearinghouse and Los Angeles County Clerk;
- mailing the NOP to responsible and trustee public agencies;
- mailing the NOP to organizations and individuals known or assumed to be interested in the proposed project;
- mailing the NOP or scoping notice to residents, businesses, and institutions in the study area;
- publishing notices the scoping meeting in newspapers of general circulation; and
- publishing notices of the scoping meeting in non-English newspapers.

The two scoping meetings were held in an open house format with information stations and illustrated display boards. The meetings were staffed by members representing Department District 7, the FRA, and the project consultant team. One meeting, held on June 24, 2002, from 5 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Union Station room in the headquarters of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, was held for the general public. Twenty-one members of the public attended the meeting. At the public scoping meeting, Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish interpreters were present for non-English-speaking members of the public. Public comment forms, two board displays, and project fact sheets were also provided in four languages: English, Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese. These materials can be found in Appendix G.

The other meeting, held on June 25, 2002, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. at the offices of Myra L. Frank and Associates, Inc., 811 W. 7th Street, was held for public agencies. A total of nine members of public agencies attended the meeting. Both meetings opened with the same PowerPoint presentation and subsequent question-and-answer period.

Additionally, scoping meetings were also held individually with several stakeholders. The stakeholders were the Los Angeles Conservancy, Friedman Bag Company, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County Supervisorial District 1, City of Los Angeles, Mayor Hahn's Office, City of Los Angeles Council Districts 9 and 14, City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works, City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, and City of Los Angeles Department of Planning. The various city departments are now involved in ongoing coordination with the project team.

7-2.3. Issues and Questions Raised During the Scoping Period

7-2.3.1 Comments Received at the Scoping Workshops

At the public scoping meeting held June 24, 2002, and the agency scoping meeting held June 25, 2002, the consultant team facilitated a question-and-answer session after each presentation. Overall comments were supportive of the project, and audience members tended to ask specific technical questions related to operation at Union Station. Some participants requested additional information regarding the number of existing tracks and potential construction of additional tracks. A few from the audience asked about the process for trains entering and exiting the station and if construction of a round-out was considered as a possible solution. There were also questions related to the study's funding and potential funding sources should construction proceed. One participant asked if the study was incorporating existing and potential plans for high-speed rail and Maglev technologies being planned for the region.

a. Written Comments Received During the Scoping Process

In addition to the seventeen written letters received during the public comment and scoping period, there were four comment sheets received at the public scoping workshops. Three letters were received after the close of the scoping comment period. Copies of the written scoping comments are provided in Appendix I.

Table 1 lists the comment letters received and the issues raised by each party. Several rail-service users echoed the need for the proposed project. Comments received via email came from individuals from the Los Angeles region as well as places outside of the immediate vicinity such as Chino, San Francisco, and Taiwan.

In summary, there is some general public support for the proposed project. However, members of the public also made clear the issues that held their concern. For example, the project is encouraged to avoid any impacts to the 1st Street Bridge; therefore, several opinions favored option 3A. There is also concern that the Los Angeles River, as well as bike routes, could be negatively impacted. One member of the public suggested a specific curvature that should be used in the project.

Comments from public agencies were generally related to various requirements and guidelines under CEQA and NEPA. One exception was the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Their central district headquarters is located within the project study area and would be affected by project alternatives.

An additional effort is currently being made on the part of the project team, with technical support of Department District 7 staff, to assist the public in understanding the environmental and planning process. It became apparent during the scoping comment period that some members of the public who submitted their comments via the website did not understand the environmental and planning process. As a result, they did not specify whether their comment was made in response to the scoping period.

Based on this, the project team decided to put together a Frequently Asked Questions tab on the website. The website is being regularly maintained and updated as new information becomes available. Those who had comments were emailed a letter that explained to them when, where, and how their letter was going to be addressed.

7-3 COMMENT FORMAL PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD OF ON THE DRAFT EIS/EIR

Copies of the document were mailed to responsible and trustee agencies, and to those who requested copies of the Draft EIS/EIR (mailing list attached). This section describes the public outreach effort during the NEPA and CEQA public review period for the proposed project. It was conducted by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Amtrak, and State of California Department of Transportation (Department).

7-3.1. Commencement and Notification of the Formal Public Review Period of the Draft EIS/EIR

The purpose of the public review period is to seek input from interested stakeholders. This includes: Responsible and Trustee agencies, the public (i.e., property owners, residents, and business owners) and other interested parties. The objective of the public review period is to identify any engineering design constraints and environmental impacts on the proposed alternatives that could render the proposed project difficult to complete. In addition, impacts to other transportation projects and public agencies' properties in the area are identified and considered.

7-3.1.1 Commencement and Notification

The NEPA public review period began with the publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. The CEQA public review period began with the posting of the Notice of Availability at the Los Angeles County Clerk, and the receipt of the Notice of Completion at the State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency will published a notice of the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR in the Federal Register: Volume 69, Number 175, on Friday, September 10, 2004. It included a brief statement about the project, contact information, and the close of the information about the circulation period, in the Federal Register.

The Department filed a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse on September 9, 2004. It also filed a Notice of Completion and a Notice of Availability with and the Los Angeles County Clerk on Friday, September 3, 2004.

7-3.1.2 Newspaper Advertising

Newspaper advertisements noticing the public hearing and the availability of the Draft EIS/EIR were published on two separate occasions in the following five newspapers: Downtown News,

Rafu Shimpō, Chinese Daily News, LA Opinion, Los Angeles Times. The first printing occasion occurred within all five of the above newspapers between the dates of September 6 and 10, 2004. It announced the proposed project and the beginning of the public review period. The second printing occasion occurred between October 4 and 8, 2004. It reminded the public of the upcoming public hearing.

The five newspapers were chosen because of their audience in the local communities that would be most affected by the proposed project. The Los Angeles Downtown News specifically focuses on events within the Los Angeles downtown area and is printed in English. The Los Angeles Times specifically focuses on the overall metropolitan area and is printed in English. The Rafu Shimpō newspaper focuses specifically on the Japanese-American community and is printed in Japanese. The Chinese Daily News newspaper specifically focuses on the Chinese-American community, and is published in Mandarin Chinese. Lastly, the LA Opinion newspaper focuses specifically on the Latin-American community and is printed in Spanish. All newspaper ads for the proposed project were printed in the appropriate language of the newspaper.

7-3.1.3 Distribution and Availability of the Draft EIS/EIR

Copies of the document were mailed to responsible and trustee agencies, to those who previously requested a copy of the document. An electronic copy of the document was placed on the project website, www.runthroughtracks.org, and physical copies of the document were placed in the following locations:

- Benjamin Franklin Library 2200 E. 1st Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90033
- Chinatown Branch Library 639 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90012
- Los Angeles Public Library, Science Department 630 W. 5th Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90071
- Little Tokyo Library 244 S. Alameda Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90012

and at

- California Department of Transportation 120 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

Any property owner which would be potentially affected by the proposed project was notified of this via posting of the Notice of Availability at the Los Angeles County Clerk, the newspaper advertising, and the mailing distribution of the Draft EIS/EIR. Personal delivery of the document (by the public outreach consultant) to any businesses that would directly be affected by the proposed project occurred on October 6, 2004. Specifically, four complete sets of documents were hand delivered to Los Angeles Police Department-Property Division, Viertel's Automotive Service, Mrs. Friday's-Fishking Processors, Inc., and B & Z Investments, Inc.

In addition, aAll persons on the project mailing list received notice-Notice of availability Availability of the Draft EIS/EIR. The project mailing list was developed over the course of the project development-and includes persons notified of or responding to scoping, attendees at public information meetings, and those who asked to be added to the mailing list via the project website or other correspondence.-(distribution list attached)- (See Table 7-14, Draft EIR/EIS Distribution List, and Table 7-2, Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List.)

Table 7-1: Draft EIR/EIS Document Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Federal | | |
| <u>U.S. Senate</u> | <u>Senator Barbara Boxer</u> | |
| <u>U.S. Senate</u> | <u>Guillermo Gonzalez</u> | <u>Senator Feinstein's Office</u> |
| <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u> | <u>Col. Richard Thompson</u> | <u>District Engineer</u> |
| <u>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</u> | <u>Office of Federal Activities</u> | <u>Mail Code 2252-A, Rm 7241</u> |
| <u>U.S. EPA Region 9 HQ</u> | <u>Sally Seymour, Director</u> | <u>Office of Planning & Public Affairs</u> |
| <u>Headquarters Environmental</u> | - | <u>1120 N. Street, Mail Station 27</u> |
| <u>State Clearinghouse</u> | <u>Terry Roberts</u> | <u>Office of Planning & Research</u> |
| <u>US Department of the Interior</u> | <u>Main Interior Bldg, MS 2340</u> | <u>Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance</u> |
| <u>Amtrak National Railroad</u> | <u>Cassim Mamoon</u> | <u>Project Manager</u> |
| - | - | - |
| State | | |
| <u>California State Senate</u> | <u>Senator Gilbert Cedillo</u> | <u>State Senate District 22</u> |
| <u>California State Assembly</u> | <u>Honorable Fabian</u> | <u>Assembly District 46</u> |
| <u>CA High Speed Rail Authority</u> | <u>M. Mehdi Morshed</u> | <u>Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>CA Dept of Fish & Game</u> | <u>Charles F. Raysbrook</u> | <u>Regional Manager</u> |
| <u>CA Native American Heritage</u> | <u>Larry Myers</u> | <u>Executive Secretary</u> |
| <u>CA Regional Water Quality</u> | <u>Dennis A. Dickerson</u> | <u>Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>CPUC</u> | <u>Wesley M. Franklin</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>CA State Dept. of Historic Preservation</u> | <u>Milford Wayne Donaldson</u> | <u>State Historic Preservation Officer</u> |
| <u>CA Dept of Transportation</u> | <u>Pat Merrill</u> | <u>Rail Division</u> |
| - | - | - |
| Regional & County | | |
| <u>SCAG - Planning & Policy Dept.</u> | <u>Betty Araos</u> | <u>Chief Financial Officer</u> |
| <u>LA County Dept. of Regional</u> | <u>James Hartl</u> | <u>Planning Director</u> |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan</u> | <u>Beatrice Proo, Chair</u> | <u>Planning & Programming Committee</u> |
| <u>Southern California Regional Rail</u> | <u>Kelly Felty, P.E.</u> | <u>Manager of Design</u> |
| - | - | - |
| City | | |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Mayor James K. Hahn</u> | - |
| <u>City of LA Planning Commission</u> | <u>Peter Weil</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>City of Vernon</u> | <u>Leonis C. Malburg</u> | <u>Mayor</u> |
| <u>City of LA Fire Dept.</u> | <u>William R. Bamattre</u> | <u>Fire Chief</u> |
| <u>City of LA Planning Dept.</u> | <u>Patricia Diefenderfer</u> | <u>Community Planner, Central City North</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Transportation</u> | <u>James Okasaki</u> | <u>Acting General Manager</u> |
| - | - | - |

Table 7-1: Draft EIR/EIS Document Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| <u>Elected Officials</u> | - | - |
| <u>LA City Council District 14</u> | <u>Krista Klein</u> | <u>Office of Antonio Villaraigosa</u> |
| <u>LA City Council District 9</u> | <u>Greg Fischer</u> | <u>Office of Jan Perry</u> |
| <u>LA City Council, District 1</u> | <u>Sharon Lowe</u> | <u>Office of Ed Reyes</u> |
| <u>LA County Board of Supervisors</u> | <u>Supervisor Yvonne</u> | - |
| - | - | - |
| <u>Individuals and Organizations</u> | - | - |
| <u>Little Tokyo Business Association</u> | - | - |
| <u>Little Tokyo Service Center</u> | <u>Bill Watanabe</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>East Los Angeles Community</u> | <u>Roberto Barragan</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Downtown Industrial</u> | <u>Tracey Lovejoy</u> | - |
| <u>Sierra Club, Los Angeles Chapter</u> | <u>Daniel Walker</u> | <u>Co-Chair Transportation Committee</u> |
| <u>The Transit Coalition</u> | <u>Bart Reed</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>Southern California Transportation and Land Use Coalition</u> | <u>Jim Bickart</u> | <u>Policy Director</u> |
| <u>Joel Bloom</u> | - | <u>716 E. Traction Avenue</u> |
| <u>ArtShare LA</u> | <u>Tracy Kelly</u> | <u>801 E. 4th Place</u> |
| <u>Sci-Arc</u> | - | <u>960 E. 3rd Street</u> |
| <u>Freidman Bag Company</u> | <u>Owner</u> | <u>706 Ducommun St</u> |
| <u>Devon Self Storage</u> | <u>Owner</u> | <u>801 E. Commercial Street</u> |
| <u>Viertels Towing Service</u> | <u>Owner</u> | <u>1155 W Temple St</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles Conservancy</u> | <u>Christy Johnson McAvoy</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Catellus</u> | <u>S. California Corporate</u> | <u>Los Angeles Union Station</u> |
| <u>Union Pacific Railroad, Government Affairs</u> | <u>Wayne Horiuchi</u> | <u>Special Representative</u> |
| - | - | - |
| <u>Library List</u> | | |
| <u>Chinatown Branch Library</u> | <u>Reference Librarian</u> | <u>536 W College Street</u> |
| <u>Benjamin Franklin Library</u> | <u>Reference Librarian</u> | <u>2200 E First Street</u> |
| <u>Little Tokyo Library</u> | <u>Reference Librarian</u> | <u>244 S Alameda St</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles Public Library</u> | <u>Ms. Sue Openheimer</u> | <u>Science Department</u> |
| - | - | - |
| <u>Scoping Meeting Attendees</u> | - | - |
| - | <u>Richard Meruelo</u> | <u>761 Terminal Street, 2nd Fl</u> |
| - | <u>Leon Karp</u> | <u>5356 Dillson St</u> |
| - | <u>Joe Linton</u> | <u>131 1/2 Bimini</u> |
| - | <u>Abbie Rosenberth</u> | - |
| - | <u>Reginald Jones-</u> | <u>111 E. 1st Street</u> |

Table 7-1: Draft EIR/EIS Document Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| - | <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #362</u> |
| <u>U.S. House of Representatives,</u> | <u>Kim Tahiki</u> | <u>Rep Roybal-Allard's Office</u> |
| - | <u>Paul Solomon</u> | <u>1855 E. Industrial Street</u> |
| - | <u>T.A. Nelson</u> | <u>2563 Dearborn Dr.</u> |
| - | <u>R.E. Finley</u> | <u>1240 Dominion Ave.</u> |
| - | <u>Terry Seto</u> | <u>268 Bronin Drive</u> |
| - | <u>Rudy Romo</u> | <u>5762 Bolsa Ave</u> |
| - | <u>Robert D. Volk</u> | <u>1440 Orlando Road</u> |
| - | <u>Andre Villa</u> | <u>6417791 Belmont</u> |
| - | <u>John A. Lee</u> | <u>1910 W. Verdugo Ave</u> |
| - | <u>Mich Sacata</u> | <u>815 E. 1st Street</u> |
| - | <u>Ken Ruben</u> | <u>4053 Duquesne Ave</u> |
| - | <u>Eugene Salinsky</u> | <u>616 N. Sweetzer Ave</u> |
| <u>BNSF Railway</u> | <u>John Fleming</u> | <u>1776 W. Marin 20</u> |
| <u>Dept of Public Works (BSL)</u> | <u>Raed Aboul Hosn</u> | <u>600 S. Spring</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering</u> | <u>Linda Moore</u> | <u>Environmental Services</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles, Dept of Public Works</u> | <u>Alfred Sosa</u> | <u>433 E. Temple</u> |
| <u>Supervisor Gloria Molina's Office</u> | <u>Suzanne Mznrquez</u> | <u>5264 Beverly Blvd.</u> |
| - | - | - |
| <u>Respondents to the Scoping</u> | - | - |
| - | <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #362</u> |
| - | <u>Kenneth Ruben</u> | <u>4053 Duquesne Ave.</u> |
| - | <u>T.A. Nelson</u> | <u>2563 Dearborn Drive</u> |
| - | <u>Read Aboulhosn</u> | <u>600 S. Spring Street</u> |
| - | <u>Joseph Dunn</u> | <u>740 S. Detraoit St. Apt 2</u> |
| - | <u>Linus Tauro</u> | <u>25631 Park Avenue</u> |
| - | <u>Mark R. Johnston</u> | <u>4185 Van Buren Street</u> |
| - | <u>Joel</u> | <u>joelk2002@yahoo.org</u> |
| - | <u>Martin Culjat</u> | <u>Sweetzer Ave</u> |
| - | <u>Ray Bianco</u> | <u>4201 via Marina #263</u> |
| - | <u>Linda Jenkins</u> | <u>23745 Sarda Road</u> |
| <u>Avery Storage Partners</u> | <u>Craig D. Olson</u> | <u>dba A-American Self Storage</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Alfred Sosa</u> | <u>Dept of Water & Power</u> |
| <u>County of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Massie Munroe</u> | <u>Dept of Public Works</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles Police Department</u> | <u>Robert B Hansohn</u> | <u>Commanding Officer Transit Group</u> |

Table 7-1: Draft EIR/EIS Document Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|------------------------|---|
| <u>South Coast Air Quality Management District</u> | <u>Steve Smith</u> | <u>Program Supervisor, CEQA Section</u> |
| <u>California Environmental Protection Agency</u> | <u>Edwin F. Lowry</u> | <u>Dept of Toxic Substances Control</u> |
| <u>Surface Transportation Board</u> | <u>Victoria Rustin</u> | <u>Chief, Environmental Analysis</u> |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Federal | | |
| <u>U.S. Dept. of Agriculture</u> | <u>Douglas Brand</u> | <u>Nat. Resources Conservation Serv.</u> |
| <u>FAA Western Pacific Region</u> | <u>Monroe P. Balton</u> | <u>Regional Counsel</u> |
| <u>U.S. Fish & Wildlife</u> | <u>Director</u> | <u>Carlsbad Office</u> |
| <u>U. S. Dept. of Housing & Urban</u> | <u>William Barth, Director</u> | <u>Comm. Planning & Dvlp, LA Office</u> |
| State | | |
| <u>Caltrans District 7 - Regional Planning</u> | <u>Rose Cassey</u> | <u>District Deputy Director</u> |
| <u>Caltrans District 7 - Environmental</u> | <u>Ron Kosinski</u> | <u>District Deputy Director</u> |
| <u>Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics</u> | <u>R. Austin Wiswell</u> | <u>Division Chief</u> |
| <u>Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics</u> | <u>Jackie Fowler</u> | <u>Executive Secretary</u> |
| <u>Caltrans</u> | <u>Doug Failing</u> | <u>Acting Director, Caltrans District 7</u> |
| <u>CA State Dept. of Historic</u> | <u>Dr. Knox Mellon</u> | <u>State Historic Preservation Officer</u> |
| <u>CA Dept. of Education- District &</u> | <u>Delaine Eastin</u> | <u>Superintendent of Public Instruction</u> |
| <u>CA Dept. of Conservation</u> | | <u>Gov't & Environmental Relations</u> |
| <u>CA Energy Commission</u> | <u>Greg Newhouse</u> | <u>California Energy Commission</u> |
| <u>CA Transportation Commission</u> | <u>Diane Eidam</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>California Highway Patrol</u> | <u>D.O. Helmick</u> | <u>Commissioner</u> |
| Regional & County | | |
| <u>Metropolitan Water Dist of Southern</u> | <u>Ronald Gastelum</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Ventura County Board of Supervisors</u> | <u>Supervisor Linda Parks</u> | <u>District 2</u> |
| <u>San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors</u> | <u>Angelica Rojas-Castro</u> | <u>Executive Secretary</u> |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan</u> | <u>Robert Snoble</u> | <u>Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>LA County Community Development</u> | <u>Carlos Jackson</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>LA Unified School District</u> | <u>Roy Romer</u> | <u>Superintendent of Schools</u> |
| <u>LA Unified School District</u> | <u>Boadmember David</u> | <u>District 5</u> |
| <u>LA Unified School District</u> | <u>Boardmember Jose</u> | <u>District 2</u> |
| <u>Metropolitan Water Dist of Southern</u> | <u>Ronald Gastelum</u> | <u>President</u> |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| <u>LA County Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>San Banh</u> | <u>Planning Division</u> |
| <u>LA County Fire Dept.</u> | <u>P. Michael Freeman</u> | <u>Chief</u> |
| <u>LA County Sheriff Dept.</u> | <u>Lee Baca</u> | <u>Sheriff</u> |
| <u>South Coast Air Quality Management</u> | <u>Barry R. Wallerstein</u> | <u>Executive Officer</u> |
| | | |
| City | | |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Transportation</u> | <u>James Okasaki</u> | <u>Acting General Manager</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of General Services</u> | <u>John Kirk Mukri</u> | <u>General Services</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>Judith A. Wilson</u> | <u>Bureau of Sanitation</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>Phil Reed</u> | <u>Bureau of Street Lighting</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of General Services</u> | <u>John Kirk Mukri</u> | <u>General Services</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>Vitaly Troyan, City</u> | <u>Bureau of Engineering</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>William E. White</u> | <u>Bureau of Street Services</u> |
| <u>City of LA Fire Dept.</u> | <u>William R. Bamattre</u> | <u>Fire Chief</u> |
| <u>City of LA Cultural Heritage</u> | <u>Honorable Kaye M.</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>City of LA Planning Dept.</u> | <u>Con Howe</u> | <u>Director of Planning</u> |
| <u>City of LA Board of Public Works</u> | <u>Valerie Lynne Shaw</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>City of LA</u> | <u>Robert Perez</u> | <u>Community Development Dept</u> |
| <u>City of LA</u> | <u>Michelle Cues</u> | <u>Dept. of Neighborhood Empowerment</u> |
| <u>Central City Association of LA</u> | <u>Carol Schatz</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Community Redevelopment Agency</u> | <u>David Farrar</u> | <u>Board of Commissioners, Chair</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept of Water & Power</u> | <u>Kenneth T. Lombard</u> | <u>President Board of Commissioners</u> |
| <u>Community Redevelopment Agency</u> | <u>Jerry A. Scharlin</u> | <u>Administrative Officer</u> |
| <u>City of LA Police Dept.</u> | <u>Martin H. Pomeroy</u> | <u>Chief of Police</u> |
| <u>LA World Airports</u> | <u>Kim Day</u> | <u>Acting Executive Director</u> |
| <u>City of LA Cultural Affairs Dept.</u> | <u>Jay M. Oren</u> | <u>Architect-Historic Preserv. Officer</u> |
| | | |
| Individuals and Organizations | | |
| <u>LA Times</u> | <u>John P. Puerner</u> | <u>Publisher & Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>La Opinion</u> | <u>Mónica Lozano</u> | <u>President & Chief Operating Officer</u> |
| <u>La Opinion</u> | <u>José Ignacio Lozano</u> | <u>Publisher & Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>Downtown Center Business</u> | <u>Carol Schatz</u> | <u>President & Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>Japanese American Cultural & Community Center</u> | <u>Cora Mirikitani</u> | <u>Interim Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>Japanese American Cultural & Community Center</u> | <u>George Aratani</u> | <u>Chairman Emeritus</u> |
| <u>Japanese American Cultural & Community Center</u> | <u>Thomas Iino, Chair</u> | <u>Board of Directors</u> |
| <u>Japanese American National Museum Board of Trustees</u> | <u>George Takei</u> | <u>Chairman of the Board</u> |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>Sierra Club Los Angeles Chapter</u> | <u>Gordon LaBedz</u> | <u>Committee Chair</u> |
| <u>Japanese American Theater</u> | | |
| <u>Latino Museum of History, Art, &</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles Conservancy</u> | <u>Christy Johnson</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Union Center for the Arts</u> | | |
| <u>Tom Gilmore Associates</u> | <u>Tom Gilmore</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of</u> | <u>Cardinal Roger</u> | |
| <u>The Los Angeles Downtown News</u> | <u>Sue Laris-Easton</u> | <u>Editor & Publisher</u> |
| <u>The Los Angeles Downtown News</u> | <u>Kathryn Maese</u> | <u>Reporter</u> |
| <u>Shelter Partnership, Inc.</u> | | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>Legal Aid Foundation Los Angeles</u> | <u>Robert B. Hubbell</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Legal Foundation Los Angeles</u> | <u>Bruce Iwasaki</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>Fashion District</u> | <u>Fashion District</u> | |
| <u>Flower District</u> | <u>Flower District</u> | |
| <u>Chinatown</u> | <u>George Yuy</u> | |
| <u>Downtown Center</u> | <u>Randall Ely</u> | |
| <u>Downtown Industrial</u> | <u>Tracey Lovejoy</u> | |
| <u>Los Angeles Historic Core</u> | <u>Kenneth Aslan</u> | |
| | | |
| <u>Residents and Businesses within</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles City</u> | | |
| <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | |
| <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | |
| <u>Mark A. Rothenberg</u> | <u>Mitchell E. Sawasy</u> | |
| <u>Graham & Bell Madison</u> | <u>Partnership</u> | |
| <u>Uyeda S K Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Daily Journal Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Thirty By Investments</u> | | |
| <u>941 Loft Associates Llc</u> | | |
| <u>First Street South Plaza</u> | | |
| <u>St James Oil Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Thomas M. Anderson</u> | | |
| <u>Unall Enterprise Inc</u> | <u>Edward Katz</u> | |
| <u>South Alameda Properties Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Gold Realty Co</u> | | |
| <u>Hung R. & Vivine H. Wang</u> | | |
| <u>Building Llc Binford</u> | | |
| <u>Minah Park</u> | <u>Jinah Sihh</u> | |
| <u>Iwata Grant K & Vicki L</u> | | |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>P T C Partnership</u> | <u>Karl L & Deanne</u> | |
| <u>Ngoc Tran Tran</u> | | |
| <u>Japan Travel Bureau Intl Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Barbara A.Blake</u> | | |
| <u>Michael J. Kamen</u> | | |
| <u>F & F Artists Lofts Assocs Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Jung Y. & Hoonae Chaing</u> | | |
| <u>Hatsuko J. Kino</u> | | |
| <u>Roth Lewis</u> | | |
| <u>Roberta E. Gill</u> | | |
| <u>Street Llc Chalmers-46</u> | | |
| <u>Bonami Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Frances K. Hashimoto</u> | | |
| <u>S. L. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Kevin C. & Helen M. Lin</u> | | |
| <u>D. Anthony & Margarita Roman</u> | | |
| <u>Joseph & Gail Zaritsky</u> | | |
| <u>Norbert F. Flores</u> | | |
| <u>Robert L. Walker</u> | | |
| <u>Anek & Montakan Bholsangngam</u> | | |
| <u>S K Uyeda Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Hiroko Rikimaru</u> | | |
| <u>S K Uyeda Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Hotel Llc Sogo</u> | | |
| <u>Pan Pacific Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Hiroshima Kenjinkai Of Southern</u> | | |
| <u>Parviz & Liselotte E. Taherpour</u> | | |
| <u>St James Oil Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Cheng & Hsieh Y. Tsai</u> | | |
| <u>Masayuki & Taka Ohashi</u> | <u>Izumi & Emiko Makino</u> | |
| <u>Hispanic Urban Center Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Hispanic Urban Center Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Yuho & Keiko Nagata</u> | | |
| <u>United Methodist Ministries</u> | <u>Los Angeles District</u> | |
| <u>K. Dave & Bertha A. Comar</u> | | |
| <u>Nolberto A. Zamora</u> | | |
| <u>Sunny Ma</u> | | |
| <u>Kenneth C. & Peggy E. Deppe</u> | | |
| <u>Naomi Olquin</u> | | |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Emma Arce</u> | <u>Carmen Villareal</u> | |
| <u>Steven S. Hanft</u> | | |
| <u>Arthur Fleischman</u> | | |
| <u>Winca Enterprises Inc</u> | | |
| <u>2nd Far East Ltd</u> | | |
| <u>Lin 2001 Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Japanese Evangelical Missionary</u> | | |
| <u>Jin Han International Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Karp Leon & Luella & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Robert & Lilia Arranaga</u> | <u>Robert Arranaga</u> | |
| <u>Celaya Oliver V & Eloise N Family</u> | | |
| <u>Phyllis Custodian Gilmore</u> | <u>Minor B Gilmore</u> | |
| <u>808 E Third St Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Archdiocese Of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Welfare Corp</u> | |
| <u>Wicksman Martin R & Davida Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Luis L. & Sherry S. Yen</u> | | |
| <u>William & Sylvia Steinberg</u> | | |
| <u>Hung R. & Vivine H. Wang</u> | | |
| <u>Arthur Fleischman</u> | | |
| <u>953 Associates Llc</u> | | |
| <u>808 E Third St Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Dale K. Ogawa</u> | | |
| <u>Frances K. Hashimoto</u> | | |
| <u>Share Los Angeles Art</u> | | |
| <u>Rosoff Gertrude & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Mutual Trading Co Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Jung Y. & Hoon A. Chaing</u> | | |
| <u>Masakazu</u> | | |
| <u>South Alameda Properties Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Senka International Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Makoto America Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Tak K. Woo</u> | <u>P W Woo & Sons Inc</u> | |
| <u>Randall 2001 Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Shun M. & Cecilia S. Lee</u> | | |
| <u>Strassburg Lorraine & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Iwata Richard & Vickie Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Iwata Grant K & Vicki L</u> | | |
| <u>Honda Yoshiye & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>San Leandro Blvd Investment Co</u> | | |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Shiu L. & Wai K. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Kyung Y. Cho</u> | | |
| <u>Claude E. & Nancy A. Kent</u> | | |
| <u>Arranaga Robert & Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>I. D. & Gayle A. Weiner</u> | | |
| <u>330 Alameda Llc</u> | | |
| <u>South Alameda Properties Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Baran Co Inc</u> | | |
| <u>William O. Brothers</u> | | |
| <u>Franklin H. Olmsted</u> | <u>F & J Olmsted</u> | |
| <u>Pauline W. Hu</u> | | |
| <u>Dora Lau</u> | | |
| <u>Peter Karadjian</u> | | |
| <u>Braver & Sauer Investments</u> | | |
| <u>Schubert Chris J Iii & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>N & R Diamond Ents</u> | | |
| <u>Avery Storage Partners L P</u> | | |
| <u>Bernard & S. Dinerstein</u> | | |
| <u>Milton Koll Family Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Barbara D. Spangler</u> | | |
| <u>440 Seaton Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Itsuo & Fusako Tachibana</u> | | |
| <u>D. Anthony & Margarita Roman</u> | | |
| <u>St James Oil Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Arthur Pt Fleischman</u> | | |
| <u>Soto Mission Zenshuji</u> | | |
| <u>Roman Catholic Archbishop Of L A</u> | | |
| <u>Fe & Washington Market I. Santa</u> | | |
| <u>Japan Travel Bureau Intl Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Roche S. Sanchez</u> | | |
| <u>Associated Shower Door Co Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Roth Lewis</u> | | |
| <u>Miller Donald Inc & P</u> | | |
| <u>Richard A. Sanchez</u> | | |
| <u>Smith James E & Elaine M Family</u> | | |
| <u>Tevet Sam & Ronit & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Western Mixers Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Pastoral Proyecto</u> | | |
| <u>Mission Investment Group</u> | | |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Chylinski Richard J & Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Salvador & Maria G. Corona</u> | | |
| <u>Robert L. & Denise E. Walker</u> | | |
| <u>Robert L. Walker</u> | | |
| <u>Carlos & Guillermo Almanza</u> | | |
| <u>Rory George E & Patricia & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Joseph & Gail Zaritsky</u> | | |
| <u>415 Molino Partnership</u> | | |
| <u>Joe & Mae Akita</u> | | |
| <u>Kelly Hames</u> | <u>Jolynn Suzar</u> | |
| <u>Roberta E. Gill</u> | | |
| <u>Molino Street Partners</u> | | |
| <u>David M. Trowbridge</u> | <u>Carol Kaufman</u> | |
| <u>Graham Madison</u> | <u>Bell Partnership</u> | |
| <u>Walker Foods Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Joseph & Gail Zaritsky</u> | | |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan</u> | | |
| <u>Michael Brewer</u> | | |
| <u>Frances K. Hashimoto</u> | | |
| <u>440 Seaton Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Martin W. & Judith D. Foreman</u> | | |
| <u>N & R Diamond Ents</u> | | |
| <u>Liliana D. Lakich</u> | | |
| <u>Muramoto Jack & Hiroko & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Rollins Llc Rollins</u> | | |
| <u>Michael J. Kamen</u> | | |
| <u>Seawind Ipr</u> | | |
| <u>Foc Electronics Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Traction Avenue Loft Associations</u> | | |
| <u>Foc Electronics Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Richard Taminosian</u> | | |
| <u>Shun M. & Cecilia S. Lee</u> | | |
| <u>Building Llc Binford</u> | | |
| <u>Fok</u> | | |
| <u>Art Building Vignes</u> | | |
| <u>Fansteel Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Phoenix Aerospace Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Nam S. Kim</u> | | |
| <u>Montakan Mathiyakom</u> | | |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| <u>Chatwadee Sangsri</u> | | |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan</u> | | |
| <u>Maier Brewing Company</u> | | |
| <u>Main Alameda</u> | | |
| <u>Terry Charles & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Bert Potter</u> | | |
| <u>Lam</u> | | |
| <u>Kenneth & Wanda Jung</u> | | |
| <u>Metropolitan Water District</u> | | |
| <u>U.S. Government</u> | | |
| <u>Chow Mark & N Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Shiu L. & Wai K. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Llc Skz</u> | | |
| <u>Moeller Roger D & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Mark F. & Norma C. Chow</u> | <u>Rosina & Philip S Wu</u> | |
| <u>Catellus Development Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Catellus Development Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles City</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan</u> | | |
| <u>Chow Mark F & Norma Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Chow Mark F & Norma Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Bert Potter</u> | | |
| <u>Hrdlicka Raymond W</u> | | |
| <u>Shiu L. & Wai K. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles Postal Employees</u> | <u>Recreational Committee</u> | |
| | | |
| <u>Other Interested Parties</u> | | |
| | <u>Samuel H. Dunlap</u> | <u>P.O. Box 1391</u> |
| <u>Gabrielino Tongva Indians of</u> | <u>Robert F. Dorame</u> | <u>Chairperson</u> |
| | <u>John Valenzuela</u> | <u>P.O. Box 402597</u> |
| <u>TI'At Society</u> | <u>Cindy Alvitre</u> | <u>15600 Mulholland Drive, Apt K</u> |
| <u>Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council</u> | <u>Anthony Morales</u> | <u>Chairperson</u> |
| <u>Island Gabrielino Group</u> | <u>John Jeffredo</u> | <u>P.O. Box 669</u> |
| | <u>Craig Torres</u> | <u>713 E. Bishop</u> |
| | <u>Alfred L. Valenzuela</u> | <u>18678 Pad Court</u> |
| | <u>Jim Velasques</u> | <u>5776 42nd Street</u> |
| <u>Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council of</u> | | <u>501 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste 500</u> |
| <u>CA Native Plant Society</u> | <u>David Chipping</u> | <u>Conservation Director</u> |
| | | |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| Scoping Meeting Attendees | | |
| | <u>Richard Meruelo</u> | <u>761 Terminal Street, 2nd Fl</u> |
| | <u>Leon Karp</u> | <u>5356 Dillson St</u> |
| | <u>Joe Linton</u> | <u>131 1/2 Bimini</u> |
| | <u>Bart Reed</u> | |
| | <u>Abbie Rosenberth</u> | |
| | <u>Reginald Jones-Saeyer</u> | <u>111 E. 1st Street</u> |
| | <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #362</u> |
| | <u>Paul Solomon</u> | <u>1855 E. Industrial Street</u> |
| | <u>T.A. Nelson</u> | <u>2563 Dearborn Dr.</u> |
| | <u>R.E. Finley</u> | <u>1240 Dominion Ave.</u> |
| | <u>Terry Seto</u> | <u>268 Bronin Drive</u> |
| | <u>Rudy Romo</u> | <u>5762 Bolsa Ave</u> |
| | <u>Robert D. Volk</u> | <u>1440 Orlando Road</u> |
| | <u>Andre Villa</u> | <u>6417791 Belmont</u> |
| | <u>John A. Lee</u> | <u>1910 W. Verdugo Ave</u> |
| | <u>Jim Rushing</u> | |
| | <u>Mich Sacata</u> | <u>815 E. 1st Street</u> |
| | <u>Ken Ruben</u> | <u>4053 Duquesne Ave</u> |
| | <u>Eugene Salinsky</u> | <u>616 N. Sweetzer Ave</u> |
| <u>Carrie Pourvadidi</u> | <u>California HighSpeed</u> | <u>925 L Street, Ste 1425</u> |
| <u>BNSF Railway</u> | <u>John Fleming</u> | <u>1776 W. Marin 20</u> |
| <u>Dept of Public Works (BSL)</u> | <u>Raed Aboul Hosn</u> | <u>600 S. Spring</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles, Bureau of</u> | <u>Linda Moore</u> | <u>Environmental Services</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles, Dept of Public</u> | <u>Alfred Sosa</u> | <u>433 E. Temple</u> |
| <u>Caltrans</u> | <u>Waren Webber</u> | <u>1120 N. Street</u> |
| | | |
| Respondents to the Scoping | | |
| <u>City of Los Angeles Police</u> | <u>Robert B Hansohn</u> | <u>Commanding Officer Transit Group</u> |
| <u>South Coast Air Quality Management</u> | <u>Steve Smith</u> | <u>Program Supervisor, CEQA Section</u> |
| | <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #362</u> |
| | <u>Kenneth Ruben</u> | <u>4053 Duquesne Ave.</u> |
| | <u>T.A. Nelson</u> | <u>2563 Dearborn Drive</u> |
| | <u>Read Aboulhosn</u> | <u>600 S. Spring Street</u> |
| <u>Friends of the Los Angeles River</u> | <u>Joe Linton</u> | <u>Los Angeles River Center & Gardens</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition</u> | <u>Executive Driver</u> | <u>634 S. Spring St, Ste 820</u> |
| <u>Surface Transportation Board</u> | <u>Vistoria Rustin</u> | <u>Chief, Environmental Analysis</u> |
| <u>County of Los Angeles Fire</u> | <u>Michael Mc Hargue</u> | <u>Inspector</u> |
| <u>THSRC</u> | <u>George H. Harris</u> | <u>100 HSIN Yi Road, Sec 5</u> |

Table 7-2: Draft EIR/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | <u>Joseph Dunn</u> | <u>740 S. Detraoit St. Apt 2</u> |
| | <u>Linus Tauro</u> | <u>25631 Park Avenue</u> |
| <u>Southern California Association of</u> | <u>Jeffery Smith</u> | <u>Semior Regional Planner</u> |
| | <u>Mark R. Johnston</u> | <u>4185 Van Buren Street</u> |
| | <u>Joel</u> | <u>joelk2002@yahoo.org</u> |
| | <u>Martin Culjat</u> | <u>Sweetzer Ave</u> |
| | <u>Ray Bianco</u> | <u>4201 via Marina #263</u> |
| | <u>Linda Jenkins</u> | <u>23745 Sarda Road</u> |
| <u>U.S. EPA</u> | <u>Nova Biازه</u> | <u>Region IX</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Vahan Pezeshkian</u> | <u>Dept of Transportation</u> |
| <u>County of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Rod H. Hubomoto</u> | <u>Dept of Public Works</u> |
| <u>Native American Heritage</u> | <u>Rob Wood</u> | <u>915 Capitol Mall, Rm 364</u> |
| <u>THSRC</u> | <u>George H. Harris</u> | <u>100 HSIN Yi Road, Sec 5</u> |
| | | |
| <u>Requested to be on the mailing list</u> | | |
| <u>Brass Unique Metal</u> | <u>Ken Fung</u> | <u>9948 Hayward Way</u> |
| - | - | - |

Copies of the Draft EIS/EIR and technical reports available at the following libraries:

- Benjamin Franklin Library — 2200 E. 1st Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90033
- Chinatown Branch Library — , Los Angeles, CA, 90012
- Los Angeles Public Library,
— Science Department — 630 W. 5th Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90071
- Little Tokyo Library — 244 S. Alameda Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90012

and at

- California Department of Transportation — 120 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

7-3.1.4 Opportunities for Commenting on the Draft EIS/EIR

Comments on the Draft EIS/EIR were accepted via the project website, in writing via fax, email or mail, phone, and at the public hearing (oral and written). The FRA and the Department will hold a public hearing near the project location. The public hearing will be held It was on October 13, 2004, from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the MTA Building, 1 Gateway Plaza, 3rd Floor Conference Room, Los Angeles, CA, 90012.

All The close of the comment periods was on the Draft EIS/EIR must be received by the close of business on October 25, 2004.

Comments ~~may be~~ submitted in the following manner:

- in writing, mailed to the persons named below;
- in writing at the public hearing;
- to a court reporter at the public hearing;
- via email at the project Internet website, www.runthroughtracks.org; or
- by fax to: “LAUS DEIS/DEIR COMMENT” at 213-627-5376/897-0685.

Comments can be addressed to either (or both) of the following persons:

- David Valenstein, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont St. NW, MS-20, Washington, D.C. 20590.
- Gary Iverson, California Department of Transportation District 7, 120 Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

All comments received will be considered and responses to substantive comments will be addressed in the Final EIR/EIS Chapter 12: Comments and Responses. Chapter 11: Clarifications and Modifications, indicates where corresponding edits or corrections to the Draft EIS/EIR were made in response to the comments received.

7-4 DISTRIBUTION OF THE FINAL EIS/EIR

The Final EIR/EIS will be distributed to those agencies, organizations, persons who commented substantively on the Draft EIR/EIS, and to any persons requesting a copy. Please see Table 7-3 for a full distribution list. The Notice of Availability will be distributed to any responsible and trustee agencies, persons, businesses and organizations whom have an interest, or have expressed an interest in the proposed project. Please see Table 7-4 for the Notice of Availability distribution list.

| Table 7-3: Final EIR/EIS Document Distribution List | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| Agency/Business/Organization | Name | Title/Department |
| Federal | | |
| U.S. Senate | Senator Barbara Boxer | |
| U.S. Senate | Guillermo Gonzalez | Senator Feinstein's Office |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Office of Federal Activities | |
| U.S. EPA Region 9 HQ | Sally Seymour, Director | Office of Planning & Public Affairs |
| Headquarters Environmental Program | | |
| US Department of the Interior | Main Interior Bldg, MS 2340 | Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance |
| Amtrak National Railroad Passenger Corp | Cassim Mamoon | Project Manager |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Lisa B. Hanf | Region IX |
| | | |

Table 7-3: Final EIR/EIS Document Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| State | | |
| <u>CA High Speed Rail Authority</u> | <u>M. Mehdi Morshed</u> | <u>Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>CPUC</u> | <u>Wesley M. Franklin</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>CA State Dept. of Historic Preservation</u> | <u>Milford Wayne Donaldson</u> | <u>State Historic Preservation Officer</u> |
| <u>CA Dept of Transportation</u> | <u>Pat Merrill</u> | <u>Rail Division</u> |
| <u>State Clearinghouse</u> | <u>Terry Roberts</u> | <u>Office of Planning & Research</u> |
| <u>State of California</u> | <u>Robert Wong</u> | <u>Dist.7, Public Transportation & Goods Movement</u> |
| <u>California Highway Patrol</u> | <u>D.O. Helmick</u> | <u>Commissioner</u> |
| <u>State of California, Department of Transportation</u> | <u>C. Beard, Captain</u> | <u>Southern Division</u> |
| Regional & County | | |
| <u>Southern California Association of Governments</u> | <u>Jeffery Smith</u> | <u>Policy and Planning Department</u> |
| <u>South Coast Air Quality Management District</u> | <u>Susan Nakamura</u> | <u>Program Supervisor, CEQA Section</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Agency</u> | <u>Susan Chapman</u> | <u>Transportation Planning Manager</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Agency</u> | <u>Mark Moorhausen</u> | <u>Senior Real Estate Officer</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</u> | <u>Douglas Kim</u> | <u>Long Range Planning</u> |
| <u>LA County Sheriff Dept.</u> | <u>Mike Kameya</u> | <u>Facilities Planning Bureau</u> |
| <u>Southern California Regional Rail Authority</u> | <u>David Solow</u> | |
| City | | |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Transportation</u> | <u>James Okasaki</u> | <u>Acting General Manager</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>David R. Leininger</u> | <u>Chief, Forestry Div, Prevention Bureau</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Mark Chimielowic</u> | <u>Dept of Public Works</u> |
| Individuals and Organizations | | |
| <u>Catellus</u> | <u>Van Bruckner</u> | <u>Los Angeles Union Station</u> |
| <u>Urgent Gear</u> | | <u>Ramin Roofian</u> |
| <u>Conoco Phillips</u> | <u>Ken Ruben</u> | |
| | <u>James Clifton</u> | |
| | <u>Dwight Hotchkiss</u> | |
| <u>Rail Passenger Association of California</u> | <u>Paul Dyson</u> | |
| <u>Avoustime Rios</u> | <u>Joyce Dillard</u> | |
| | <u>John Ulloth</u> | |
| <u>Los Angeles Police Department</u> | <u>Facility Supervisor</u> | <u>Property Division</u> |
| <u>Devon Self Storage</u> | <u>Owner</u> | |
| <u>Los Angeles Conservancy</u> | <u>Christy Johnson McAvoy</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Mrs. Friday's-Fishing Processors, Inc.</u> | <u>Plant Supervisor</u> | <u>Corporate Office</u> |
| <u>B&Z Investments, Inc.</u> | | |
| <u>Virtel's Automotive Service</u> | <u>Manager</u> | |
| <u>Mr. Hong Kong</u> | | |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Federal | | |
| <u>U.S. Dept. of Agriculture</u> | <u>Douglas Brand</u> | <u>Nat. Resources Conservation Serv.</u> |
| <u>FAA Western Pacific Region</u> | <u>Monroe P. Balton</u> | <u>Regional Counsel</u> |
| <u>U.S. Fish & Wildlife</u> | <u>Director</u> | <u>Carlsbad Office</u> |
| <u>U. S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development</u> | <u>William Barth, Director</u> | <u>Comm. Planning & Dvlp, LA Office</u> |
| <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u> | <u>Col. Richard Thompson</u> | <u>District Engineer</u> |
| State | | |
| <u>California State Senate</u> | <u>Senator Gilbert Cedillo</u> | <u>State Senate District 22</u> |
| <u>California State Assembly</u> | <u>Honorable Fabian Nunez</u> | <u>Assembly District 46</u> |
| <u>Caltrans District 7 - Regional Planning</u> | <u>Rose Cassey</u> | <u>District Deputy Director</u> |
| <u>Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics</u> | <u>R. Austin Wiswell</u> | <u>Division Chief</u> |
| <u>CA Dept. of Education- District & School Support Divi.</u> | <u>Delaine Eastin</u> | <u>Superintendent of Public Instruction</u> |
| <u>CA Dept. of Conservation</u> | | <u>Gov't & Environmental Relations</u> |
| <u>CA Energy Commission</u> | <u>Greg Newhouse</u> | <u>California Energy Commission</u> |
| <u>CA Transportation Commission</u> | <u>Diane Eidam</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>CA Native American Heritage Commission</u> | <u>Larry Myers</u> | <u>Executive Secretary</u> |
| <u>CA Regional Water Quality Control Board - LA Region</u> | <u>Dennis A. Dickerson</u> | <u>Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>CA Dept of Fish & Game</u> | <u>Charles F. Raysbrook</u> | <u>Regional Manager</u> |
| Regional & County | | |
| <u>Metropolitan Water Dist of Southern CA</u> | <u>Ronald Gastelum</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Ventura County Board of Supervisors</u> | <u>Supervisor Linda Parks</u> | <u>District 2</u> |
| <u>San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors</u> | <u>Angelica Rojas-Castro</u> | <u>Executive Secretary</u> |
| <u>LA County Community Development Commission</u> | <u>Carlos Jackson</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>LA Unified School District</u> | <u>Roy Romer</u> | <u>Superintendent of Schools</u> |
| <u>LA Unified School District</u> | <u>Boardmember David Tokofsky</u> | <u>District 5</u> |
| <u>LA Unified School District</u> | <u>Boardmember Jose Huizar</u> | <u>District 2</u> |
| <u>Metropolitan Water Dist of Southern CA</u> | <u>Ronald Gastelum</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>LA County Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>San Banh</u> | <u>Planning Division</u> |
| <u>LA County Fire Dept.</u> | <u>P. Michael Freeman</u> | <u>Chief</u> |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</u> | <u>Beatrice Proo, Chair</u> | <u>Planning & Programming Committee</u> |
| <u>Southern California Regional Rail Authority</u> | <u>Kelly Felty, P.E.</u> | <u>Manager of Design</u> |
| <u>LA County Dept. of Regional Planning</u> | <u>James Hartl</u> | <u>Planning Director</u> |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/SIEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| Agency/Business/Organization | Name | Title/Department |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <u>City</u> | | |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of General Services</u> | <u>John Kirk Mukri</u> | <u>General Services</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>Judith A. Wilson</u> | <u>Bureau of Sanitation</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>Phil Reed</u> | <u>Bureau of Street Lighting</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of General Services</u> | <u>John Kirk Mukri</u> | <u>General Services</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>Vitaly Troyan, City Engineer</u> | <u>Bureau of Engineering</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept. of Public Works</u> | <u>William E. White</u> | <u>Bureau of Street Services</u> |
| <u>City of LA Fire Dept.</u> | <u>William R. Bamattre</u> | <u>Fire Chief</u> |
| <u>City of LA Cultural Heritage Commission</u> | <u>Honorable Kaye M. Beckham</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>City of LA Planning Dept.</u> | <u>Con Howe</u> | <u>Director of Planning</u> |
| <u>City of LA Board of Public Works</u> | <u>Valerie Lynne Shaw</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>City of LA</u> | <u>Robert Perez</u> | <u>Community Development Dept</u> |
| <u>City of LA</u> | <u>Michelle Cues</u> | <u>Dept. of Neighborhood Empowerment</u> |
| <u>Central City Association of LA</u> | <u>Carol Schatz</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Community Redevelopment Agency</u> | <u>David Farrar</u> | <u>Board of Commissioners, Chair</u> |
| <u>City of LA Dept of Water & Power</u> | <u>Kenneth T. Lombard</u> | <u>President Board of Commissioners</u> |
| <u>Community Redevelopment Agency</u> | <u>Jerry A. Scharlin</u> | <u>Administrative Officer</u> |
| <u>City of LA Police Dept.</u> | <u>Martin H. Pomeroy</u> | <u>Chief of Police</u> |
| <u>LA World Airports</u> | <u>Kim Day</u> | <u>Acting Executive Director</u> |
| <u>City of LA Cultural Affairs Dept.</u> | <u>Jay M. Oren</u> | <u>Architect-Historic Preserv. Officer</u> |
| <u>City of LA Fire Dept.</u> | <u>William R. Bamattre</u> | <u>Fire Chief</u> |
| <u>City of LA Planning Dept.</u> | <u>Patricia Diefnderfer</u> | <u>Community Planner, Central City North</u> |
| <u>City of Vernon</u> | <u>Leonis C. Malburg</u> | <u>Mayor</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Mayor James K. Hahn</u> | |
| <u>City of LA Planning Commission</u> | <u>Peter Weil</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Miles Mitchell</u> | <u>Department of Transportation</u> |
| | | |
| <u>Individuals and Organizations</u> | | |
| <u>Downtown Center Business Improvement District</u> | <u>Carol Schatz</u> | <u>President & Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>Japanese American Cultural & Community Center</u> | <u>Thomas Iino, Chair</u> | <u>Board of Directors</u> |
| <u>Japanese American National Museum Board of Trustees</u> | <u>George Takei</u> | <u>Chairman of the Board</u> |
| <u>Sierra Club Los Angeles Chapter</u> | <u>Gordon LaBedz</u> | <u>Committee Chair</u> |
| <u>Japanese American Theater</u> | | |
| <u>Latino Museum of History, Art, & Culture</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles Conservancy</u> | <u>Christy Johnson McAvoy</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Union Center for the Arts</u> | | |
| <u>Tom Gilmore Associates</u> | <u>Tom Gilmore</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Cardinal Roger Mahoney</u> | |
| <u>Shelter Partnership, Inc.</u> | | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>Legal Foundation Los Angeles</u> | <u>Bruce Iwasaki</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>Fashion District</u> | <u>Fashion District</u> | |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Flower District</u> | <u>Flower District</u> | |
| <u>Chinatown</u> | <u>George Yuy</u> | |
| <u>Downtown Center</u> | <u>Randall Ely</u> | |
| <u>Downtown Industrial</u> | <u>Tracey Lovejoy</u> | |
| <u>Los Angeles Historic Core</u> | <u>Kenneth Aslan</u> | |
| <u>Little Tokyo Business Association</u> | | |
| <u>Little Tokyo Service Center</u> | <u>Bill Watanabe</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>East Los Angeles Community Corporation</u> | <u>Roberto Barragan</u> | <u>President</u> |
| <u>Downtown Industrial</u> | <u>Tracey Lovejoy</u> | |
| <u>Sierra Club, Los Angeles Chapter</u> | <u>Daniel Walker</u> | <u>Co-Chair Transportation Committee</u> |
| <u>The Transit Coalition</u> | <u>Bart Reed</u> | <u>Executive Director</u> |
| <u>Southern California Transportation and Land Use Coalition</u> | <u>Jim Bickart</u> | <u>Policy Director</u> |
| <u>Joel Bloom</u> | | <u>716 E. Traction Avenue</u> |
| <u>ArtShare LA</u> | <u>Tracy Kelly</u> | <u>801 E. 4th Place</u> |
| <u>Sci-Arc</u> | | <u>960 E. 3rd Street</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles Conservancy</u> | <u>Christy Johnson McAvoy</u> | <u>President</u> |
| | | |
| <u>Residents and Businesses within Project Boundaries</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles City</u> | | |
| <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | |
| <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | <u>Dynamic Builders Inc</u> | |
| <u>Mark A. Rothenberg</u> | <u>Mitchell E. Sawasy</u> | |
| <u>Graham & Bell Madison</u> | <u>Partnership</u> | |
| <u>Uyeda S K Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Daily Journal Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Thirty By Investments</u> | | |
| <u>941 Loft Associates Llc</u> | | |
| <u>First Street South Plaza</u> | | |
| <u>St James Oil Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Thomas M. Anderson</u> | | |
| <u>Unall Enterprise Inc</u> | <u>Edward Katz</u> | |
| <u>South Alameda Properties Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Gold Realty Co</u> | | |
| <u>Hung R. & Vivine H. Wang</u> | | |
| <u>Building Llc Binford</u> | | |
| <u>Minah Park</u> | <u>Jinah Sihh</u> | |
| <u>Iwata Grant K & Vicki L</u> | | |
| <u>P T C Partnership</u> | <u>Karl L & Deanne Sussman</u> | |
| <u>Ngoc Tran Tran</u> | | |
| <u>Japan Travel Bureau Intl Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Barbara A.Blake</u> | | |
| <u>Michael J. Kamen</u> | | |
| <u>F & F Artists Lofts Assocs Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Jung Y. & Hoonae Chaing</u> | | |
| <u>Hatsuko J. Kino</u> | | |

Table 7-4: Final EIRS/EIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Roth Lewis</u> | | |
| <u>Roberta E. Gill</u> | | |
| <u>Street Llc Chalmers-46</u> | | |
| <u>Bonami Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Frances K. Hashimoto</u> | | |
| <u>S. L. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Kevin C. & Helen M. Lin</u> | | |
| <u>D. Anthony & Margarita Roman</u> | | |
| <u>Joseph & Gail Zaritsky</u> | | |
| <u>Norbert F. Flores</u> | | |
| <u>Robert L. Walker</u> | | |
| <u>Anek & Montakan Bholsangngam</u> | | |
| <u>S K Uyeda Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Hiroko Rikimaru</u> | | |
| <u>Hotel Llc Sogo</u> | | |
| <u>Pan Pacific Investment Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Hiroshima Kenjinkai Of Southern California</u> | | |
| <u>Parviz & Liselotte E. Taherpour</u> | | |
| <u>St James Oil Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Cheng & Hsieh Y. Tsai</u> | | |
| <u>Masayuki & Taka Ohashi</u> | <u>Izumi & Emiko Makino</u> | |
| <u>Hispanic Urban Center Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Yuho & Keiko Nagata</u> | | |
| <u>United Methodist Ministries</u> | <u>Los Angeles District</u> | |
| <u>K. Dave & Bertha A. Comar</u> | | |
| <u>Nolberto A. Zamora</u> | | |
| <u>Sunny Ma</u> | | |
| <u>Kenneth C. & Peggy E. Deppe</u> | | |
| <u>Naomi Olguin</u> | | |
| <u>Emma Arce</u> | <u>Carmen Villareal</u> | |
| <u>Steven S. Hanft</u> | | |
| <u>Arthur Fleischman</u> | | |
| <u>Winca Enterprises Inc</u> | | |
| <u>2nd Far East Ltd</u> | | |
| <u>Lin 2001 Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Japanese Evangelical Missionary Society</u> | | |
| <u>Jin Han International Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Karp Leon & Luella Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Robert & Lilia Arranaga</u> | <u>Robert Arranaga</u> | |
| <u>Celaya Oliver V & Eloise N Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Phyllis Custodian Gilmore</u> | <u>Minor B Gilmore</u> | |
| <u>808 E Third St Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Archdiocese Of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Welfare Corp</u> | |
| <u>Wicksman Martin R & Davida Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Luis L. & Sherry S. Yen</u> | | |
| <u>William & Sylvia Steinberg</u> | | |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Hung R. & Vivine H. Wang</u> | | |
| <u>Arthur Fleischman</u> | | |
| <u>953 Associates Llc</u> | | |
| <u>808 E Third St Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Dale K. Ogawa</u> | | |
| <u>Frances K. Hashimoto</u> | | |
| <u>Share Los Angeles Art</u> | | |
| <u>Rosoff Gertrude & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Mutual Trading Co Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Jung Y. & Hoon A. Chaing</u> | | |
| <u>Masakazu</u> | | |
| <u>South Alameda Properties Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Senka International Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Makoto America Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Tak K. Woo</u> | <u>P W Woo & Sons Inc</u> | |
| <u>Randall 2001 Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Shun M. & Cecilia S. Lee</u> | | |
| <u>Strassburg Lorraine & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Iwata Richard & Vickie Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Iwata Grant K & Vicki L</u> | | |
| <u>Honda Yoshiye & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>San Leandro Blvd Investment Co</u> | | |
| <u>Shiu L. & Wai K. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Kyung Y. Cho</u> | | |
| <u>Claude E. & Nancy A. Kent</u> | | |
| <u>Arranaga Robert & Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>I. D. & Gayle A. Weiner</u> | | |
| <u>330 Alameda Llc</u> | | |
| <u>South Alameda Properties Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Baran Co Inc</u> | | |
| <u>William O. Brothers</u> | | |
| <u>Franklin H. Olmsted</u> | <u>F & J Olmsted</u> | |
| <u>Pauline W. Hu</u> | | |
| <u>Dora Lau</u> | | |
| <u>Peter Karadjian</u> | | |
| <u>Braver & Sauer Investments</u> | | |
| <u>Schubert Chris J Iii & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>N & R Diamond Ents</u> | | |
| <u>Avery Storage Partners L P</u> | | |
| <u>Bernard & S. Dinerstein</u> | | |
| <u>Milton Koll Family Llc</u> | | |
| <u>Barbara D. Spangler</u> | | |
| <u>440 Seaton Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Itsuo & Fusako Tachibana</u> | | |
| <u>D. Anthony & Margarita Roman</u> | | |
| <u>St James Oil Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Arthur Pt Fleischman</u> | | |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Soto Mission Zenshuji</u> | | |
| <u>Roman Catholic Archbishop Of L A</u> | | |
| <u>Fe & Washington Market I. Santa</u> | | |
| <u>Japan Travel Bureau Intl Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Roche S. Sanchez</u> | | |
| <u>Associated Shower Door Co Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Roth Lewis</u> | | |
| <u>Miller Donald Inc & P</u> | | |
| <u>Richard A. Sanchez</u> | | |
| <u>Smith James E & Elaine M Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Tevet Sam & Ronit & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Western Mixers Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Pastoral Proyecto</u> | | |
| <u>Mission Investment Group</u> | | |
| <u>Chylinski Richard J & Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Salvador & Maria G. Corona</u> | | |
| <u>Robert L. & Denise E. Walker</u> | | |
| <u>Robert L. Walker</u> | | |
| <u>Carlos & Guillermo Almanza</u> | | |
| <u>Rory George E & Patricia & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>415 Molino Partnership</u> | | |
| <u>Joe & Mae Akita</u> | | |
| <u>Kelly Hames</u> | <u>Jolynn Suzar</u> | |
| <u>Roberta E. Gill</u> | | |
| <u>Molino Street Partners</u> | | |
| <u>David M. Trowbridge</u> | <u>Carol Kaufman</u> | |
| <u>Graham Madison</u> | <u>Bell Partnership</u> | |
| <u>Walker Foods Inc</u> | | |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</u> | | |
| <u>Michael Brewer</u> | | |
| <u>Frances K. Hashimoto</u> | | |
| <u>440 Seaton Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Martin W. & Judith D. Foreman</u> | | |
| <u>N & R Diamond Ents</u> | | |
| <u>Liliana D. Lakich</u> | | |
| <u>Muramoto Jack & Hiroko & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Rollins Llc Rollins</u> | | |
| <u>Michael J. Kamen</u> | | |
| <u>Seawind Ipr</u> | | |
| <u>Foc Electronics Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Traction Avenue Loft Associations</u> | | |
| <u>Foc Electronics Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Richard Taminosian</u> | | |
| <u>Shun M. & Cecilia S. Lee</u> | | |
| <u>Building Llc Binford</u> | | |
| <u>Fok</u> | | |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Art Building Vignes</u> | | |
| <u>Fansteel Inc</u> | | |
| <u>Phoenix Aerospace Corp</u> | | |
| <u>Nam S. Kim</u> | | |
| <u>Montakan Mathiyakom</u> | | |
| <u>Chatwadee Sangsri</u> | | |
| <u>LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</u> | | |
| <u>Maier Brewing Company</u> | | |
| <u>Main Alameda</u> | | |
| <u>Terry Charles & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Bert Potter</u> | | |
| <u>Lam</u> | | |
| <u>Kenneth & Wanda Jung</u> | | |
| <u>Metropolitan Water District</u> | | |
| <u>U.S. Government</u> | | |
| <u>Chow Mark & N Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Shiu L. & Wai K. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Llc Skz</u> | | |
| <u>Moeller Roger D & Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Mark F. & Norma C. Chow</u> | <u>Rosina & Philip S Wu</u> | |
| <u>Catellus Development Corporation</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles City</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</u> | | |
| <u>Chow Mark F & Norma Family Trust</u> | | |
| <u>Hrdlicka Raymond W</u> | | |
| <u>Shiu L. & Wai K. Kwan</u> | | |
| <u>Los Angeles Postal Employees Welfare</u> | <u>Recreational Committee</u> | |
| | | |
| <u>Other Interested Parties</u> | | |
| | <u>Samuel H. Dunlap</u> | <u>P.O. Box 1391</u> |
| <u>Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council</u> | <u>Robert F. Dorame</u> | <u>Chairperson</u> |
| | <u>John Valenzuela</u> | <u>P.O. Box 402597</u> |
| <u>TI'At Society</u> | <u>Cindy Alvitre</u> | <u>15600 Mulholland Drive, Apt K</u> |
| <u>Gabrieleno/Tongva Tribal Council</u> | <u>Anthony Morales</u> | <u>Chairperson</u> |
| <u>Island Gabrielino Group</u> | <u>John Jeffredo</u> | <u>P.O. Box 669</u> |
| | <u>Craig Torres</u> | <u>713 E. Bishop</u> |
| | <u>Alfred L. Valenzuela</u> | <u>18678 Pad Court</u> |
| | <u>Jim Velasques</u> | <u>5776 42nd Street</u> |
| <u>Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council of the Gabrielino Tongva Nation</u> | | <u>501 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste 500</u> |
| <u>CA Native Plant Society</u> | <u>David Chipping</u> | <u>Conservation Director</u> |
| <u>Catellus</u> | <u>S. California Corporate Office</u> | <u>Los Angeles Union Station</u> |
| <u>Union Pacific Railroad, Government Affairs</u> | <u>Wayne Horiuchi</u> | <u>Special Representative</u> |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|--|---|---|
| Elected Officials | | |
| <u>LA City Council District 14</u> | <u>Krista Klein</u> | <u>Office of Antonio Villaraigosa</u> |
| <u>LA City Council District 9</u> | <u>Greg Fischer</u> | <u>Office of Jan Perry</u> |
| <u>LA City Council, District 1</u> | <u>Sharon Lowe</u> | <u>Office of Ed Reyes</u> |
| <u>LA County Board of Supervisors District 2</u> | <u>Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke</u> | |
| Scoping Meeting Attendees | | |
| | <u>Richard Meruelo</u> | <u>761 Terminal Street, 2nd Fl</u> |
| | <u>Leon Karp</u> | <u>5356 Dillson St</u> |
| | <u>Joe Linton</u> | <u>131 1/2 Bimini</u> |
| | <u>Bart Reed</u> | |
| | <u>Abbie Rosenberth</u> | |
| | <u>Reginald Jones-Saeyer</u> | <u>111 E. 1st Street</u> |
| | <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #362</u> |
| | <u>Paul Solomon</u> | <u>1855 E. Industrial Street</u> |
| | <u>T.A. Nelson</u> | <u>2563 Dearborn Dr.</u> |
| | <u>R.E. Finley</u> | <u>1240 Dominion Ave.</u> |
| | <u>Terry Seto</u> | <u>268 Bronin Drive</u> |
| | <u>Rudy Romo</u> | <u>5762 Bolsa Ave</u> |
| | <u>Robert D. Volk</u> | <u>1440 Orlando Road</u> |
| | <u>Andre Villa</u> | <u>6417791 Belmont</u> |
| | <u>John A. Lee</u> | <u>1910 W. Verdugo Ave</u> |
| | <u>Jim Rushing</u> | |
| | <u>Mich Sacata</u> | <u>815 E. 1st Street</u> |
| | <u>Ken Ruben</u> | <u>4053 Duquesne Ave</u> |
| | <u>Eugene Salinsky</u> | <u>616 N. Sweetzer Ave</u> |
| <u>Carrie Pourvadidi</u> | <u>California HighSpeed Rail</u> | <u>925 L Street, Ste 1425</u> |
| <u>BNSF Railway</u> | <u>John Fleming</u> | <u>1776 W. Marin 20</u> |
| <u>Dept of Public Works (BSL)</u> | <u>Raed Aboul Hosn</u> | <u>600 S. Spring</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering</u> | <u>Linda Moore</u> | <u>Environmental Services</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles, Dept of Public Works</u> | <u>Alfred Sosa</u> | <u>433 E. Temple</u> |
| <u>Caltrans</u> | <u>Waren Webber</u> | <u>1120 N. Street</u> |
| <u>Supervisor Gloria Molina's Office</u> | <u>Suzanne Mznrquez</u> | <u>5264 Beverly Blvd.</u> |
| Respondents to the Scoping Process | | |
| <u>City of Los Angeles Police Department</u> | <u>Robert B Hansohn</u> | <u>Commanding Officer Transit Group</u> |
| <u>South Coast Air Quality Management District</u> | <u>Steve Smith</u> | <u>Program Supervisor, CEQA Section</u> |
| | <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #362</u> |
| | <u>Kenneth Ruben</u> | <u>4053 Duquesne Ave.</u> |
| | <u>T.A. Nelson</u> | <u>2563 Dearborn Drive</u> |
| | <u>Read Aboulhosn</u> | <u>600 S. Spring Street</u> |
| <u>Friends of the Los Angeles River</u> | <u>Joe Linton</u> | <u>Los Angeles River Center & Gardens</u> |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| <u>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition</u> | <u>Executive Driver</u> | <u>634 S. Spring St, Ste 820</u> |
| <u>Surface Transportation Board</u> | <u>Vistoria Rustin</u> | <u>Chief, Environmental Analysis</u> |
| <u>County of Los Angeles Fire Department</u> | <u>Michael Mc Hargue</u> | <u>Inspector</u> |
| <u>THSRC</u> | <u>George H. Harris</u> | <u>100 HSIN Yi Road, Sec 5</u> |
| | <u>Joseph Dunn</u> | <u>740 S. Detraoit St. Apt 2</u> |
| | <u>Linus Tauro</u> | <u>25631 Park Avenue</u> |
| <u>Southern California Association of Governments</u> | <u>Jeffery Smith</u> | <u>Semior Regional Planner</u> |
| | <u>Mark R. Johnston</u> | <u>4185 Van Buren Street</u> |
| | <u>Joel</u> | <u>joelk2002@yahoo.org</u> |
| | <u>Martin Culjat</u> | <u>Sweetzer Ave</u> |
| | <u>Ray Bianco</u> | <u>4201 via Marina #263</u> |
| | <u>Linda Jenkins</u> | <u>23745 Sarda Road</u> |
| <u>U.S. EPA</u> | <u>Nova Biazej</u> | <u>Region IX</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Vahan Pezeshkian</u> | <u>Dept of Transportation</u> |
| <u>County of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Rod H. Hubomoto</u> | <u>Dept of Public Works</u> |
| <u>Native American Heritage Commission</u> | <u>Rob Wood</u> | <u>915 Capitol Mall, Rm 364</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles Police Department</u> | <u>Robert B Hansohn</u> | <u>Commanding Officer Transit Group</u> |
| <u>California Environmental Protection Agency</u> | <u>Edwin F. Lowry</u> | <u>Dept of Toxic Substances Control</u> |
| | | |
| <u>Requested to be on the mailing list</u> | | |
| <u>Brass Unique Metal</u> | <u>Ken Fung</u> | <u>9948 Hayward Way</u> |
| <u>DysonRail</u> | <u>Paul Dyson</u> | <u>623 S Orchard Drive</u> |
| | <u>Warren Quon</u> | <u>1101 W. 38th Street</u> |
| <u>URS Corporation</u> | <u>Allen Blodgett, PE</u> | <u>2020 E First Street, Ste 400</u> |
| <u>Joe Conant</u> | | <u>5010 S. Marlyin</u> |
| <u>Orangeline Development Authority</u> | | <u>16401 Paramount Blvd</u> |
| <u>Craig Barnes</u> | | <u>21655 Bear Valley Rd #4</u> |
| <u>IFC Almaty Kazakhstan</u> | <u>Gorton De Mond</u> | <u>PO Box 27839, MSN JB 3-100</u> |
| <u>Howard M. Rubin</u> | | <u>485 E. Laurel Ave</u> |
| <u>Willam Rice Productions</u> | <u>William Rice</u> | <u>5025 S. Eastern Ave, #16-132</u> |
| | <u>Jim Geier</u> | <u>3525 Del Mar HTS RD #400</u> |
| | <u>Steve Kelly</u> | <u>8671 BELMONT ST.</u> |
| | <u>Barry Koeb</u> | <u>P. O. Box 1500</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>Miles Mitchell</u> | <u>Department of Transportation</u> |
| <u>Southern California Regional Rail Authority</u> | <u>David Solow</u> | <u>Chief Executive Officer</u> |
| <u>Urgent Gear, Inc.</u> | <u>Ramin Roofian</u> | <u>501 North Center Street</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles Police Department</u> | <u>Facility Supervisor</u> | <u>Property Division</u> |
| <u>Mrs. Friday's-Fishing Processors, Inc.</u> | <u>Plant Supervisor</u> | <u>Corporate Office</u> |
| <u>City of LA Planning Dept.</u> | <u>Ms. Patricia Diefnderfer</u> | <u>Community Planner, Central City North</u> |
| <u>Avery Storage Partners</u> | <u>Craig D. Olson</u> | <u>dba A-American Self Storage</u> |
| <u>Joel Bloom</u> | | <u>716 E. Traction Avenue</u> |
| <u>ArtShare LA</u> | <u>Tracy Kelly</u> | <u>801 E. 4th Place</u> |
| <u>Sci-Arc</u> | | <u>960 E. 3rd Street</u> |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/IEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Attended Public Hearing | | |
| <u>Charles Varnes</u> | | <u>925 Calle Serra</u> |
| <u>John H Lee</u> | | <u>814 S. Verdugo Rd, Apt 10</u> |
| <u>Ken Ruben</u> | | <u>4353 Duquesne Ave, Apt E</u> |
| <u>Ramin Roofian</u> | <u>Urgent Gear</u> | <u>1016 E. 14th Place</u> |
| <u>Robert Meinert</u> | | <u>7161 Hidden Pine Drive</u> |
| <u>Dwight Hotchkiss</u> | | <u>601 S. Figueroa Street</u> |
| <u>Ken Jacobs</u> | | <u>2114 S. Hill Street</u> |
| <u>Avoustime Rios</u> | <u>Joyce Dillard</u> | <u>PO Box 31377</u> |
| <u>MTA</u> | <u>Susan Chapman</u> | <u>One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-23-02</u> |
| <u>Caltrans</u> | <u>Crisanto Tomongon</u> | |
| <u>Amtrak</u> | <u>Cassim Mamoon</u> | |
| <u>Bill Coleman</u> | | <u>902 Hidalgo</u> |
| <u>Bruce Shelburne</u> | | <u>330 S. Santa Fe</u> |
| <u>Ed Von Nordick</u> | | <u>PO BOX 2768</u> |
| <u>James Clifton</u> | | <u>13130 3/4 Valleyheart</u> |
| <u>Amtrak</u> | <u>Gil Mallery</u> | |
| <u>Lou Cluster</u> | | <u>4900 Rivergrade Road</u> |
| <u>L.T. Lund</u> | | <u>3245 Lowery</u> |
| <u>Mark R. Johnston</u> | | <u>4185 Van Buren Street</u> |
| <u>Dynamic Builders</u> | <u>Carol Lebowitz</u> | <u>2114 S. Hill Street</u> |
| <u>MTA</u> | <u>Melvin Clark</u> | <u>Division 20</u> |
| <u>Bill Pollard</u> | | <u>3005 Baxter</u> |
| <u>Eugene Salinsky</u> | | <u>616 N Sweetzer Ave.</u> |
| <u>Dana Gabbard</u> | | <u>3010 Wilshire Blvd #302</u> |
| <u>Dick Finley</u> | | <u>1240 Dominion</u> |
| <u>Bart Reed</u> | | |
| Responded to DEIR/S | | |
| <u>Southern California Regional Rail Authority</u> | <u>David Solow</u> | <u>700 S. Flower Street, 26th Floor</u> |
| <u>South Coast Air Quality Management District</u> | <u>Susan Nakamura</u> | <u>21865 Copley Drive</u> |
| <u>Dynamic Builders</u> | <u>Carol Lebowitz</u> | <u>2114 S. Hill Street</u> |
| <u>Urgent Gear</u> | <u>Ramin Roofian</u> | <u>1016 E. 14th Place</u> |
| <u>Dynamic Builders</u> | <u>Ken Jackson</u> | <u>2114 S. Hill Street</u> |
| <u>Conoco Phillips</u> | <u>Ken Ruben</u> | <u>4353 Duquesne Ave, Apt E</u> |
| <u>James Clifton</u> | | <u>13130 3/4 Valleyheart</u> |
| <u>Dwight Hotchkiss</u> | | <u>601 S. Figueroa Street</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles County Sherif</u> | <u>Mike Kameya</u> | <u>Facilities Planning Bureau</u> |
| <u>Rail Passenger Association of California</u> | <u>Paul Dyson</u> | |
| <u>Avoustime Rios</u> | <u>Joyce Dillard</u> | <u>PO Box 31377</u> |
| <u>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</u> | <u>Lisa B. Hanf</u> | <u>Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street</u> |
| <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</u> | <u>Douglas Kim</u> | <u>Long Range Planning</u> |
| <u>City of Los Angeles</u> | <u>James Okasaki</u> | <u>Department of Transportation</u> |

Table 7-4: Final EIR/SIEIS Notice of Availability Distribution List

| <u>Agency/Business/Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> | <u>Title/Department</u> |
|---|--------------------|--|
| State of California, Governor's Office of Planning & Research | Terry Roberts | State Clearinghouse |
| State of California, Department of Transportation | C. Beard, Captain | Southern Division |
| City of Los Angeles | David R. Leininger | Chief, Forestry Div, Prevention Bureau |
| Southern California Association of Governments | Jeffery B Smith | 818 W. 7th Street, 12th floor |
| | John Ulloth | 10609 Columbus Ave |

7-5 WHAT NEXT?

Prior to approving the proposed project, the Department must certify that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR, that the FEIR and a Notice of Determination will be filed in accordance with CEQA, NEPA and department requirements. Additionally, the information contained in the FEIR reflects the independent judgment of agencies. When the FRA completes its approval process, a Record of Decision will be filed in accordance with NEPA procedures.

7-5.1. Mitigation Monitoring Program

Pursuant to CEQA, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program will be developed to ensure the implementation of the adopted mitigation measures; those measures shall be fully enforceable. The Department will adopt the mitigation monitoring program in conjunction with the findings required under CEQA at the time it considers certification of the FEIR and decides whether to approve the project.

CHAPTER 6 - SECTION 4(f) AND SECTION 6(f) EVALUATION

6-1 APPLICATION OF SECTION 4(f)

6-1.1 Introduction

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, codified at 49 USC § 303, declares that “[i]t is the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.”

Section 4(f) specifies that “[t]he Secretary [of Transportation] may approve a transportation program or project . . . requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, state, or local significance (as determined by the federal, state, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge or site) only if –

- (1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and
- (2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.”

Section 4(f) further requires consultation with the Department of Interior and, as appropriate, the involved offices of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and relevant state and local officials, in developing transportation projects and programs that use lands protected by Section 4(f).

The proposed project, as described in Section 6-2, Proposed Action, is a transportation project that may receive federal funding and/or discretionary approvals through one or more agencies of the U.S. Department of Transportation (i.e., the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and/or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)); therefore, documentation of compliance with Section 4(f) is required.

The rest of this chapter presents a draft evaluation of the application of Section 4(f) to the Run-Through Tracks Project. No final 4(f) statement is being approved at this time. A final statement would be prepared at the point in time when one or more of the Transportation Department agencies issues an approval for the Run-Through Tracks Project, either through a grant of federal funds or a discretionary approval under relevant federal statutes or regulations.

This Section 4(f) evaluation has been prepared in accordance with the FRA *Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts* (1999) and the FHWA/FTA regulations for Section 4(f) compliance codified at 23 CFR §771.135. Additional guidance has been obtained from the FHWA *Technical Advisory T 6640.8A* (1987), *FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper* (1987), *FHWA Western Resource Center Section 4(f) Checklist* (1997), and *FHWA California Division Environmental Checklist—“Draft” Environmental Documents* (1998).

6-1.2 Section 4(f) “Use”

As defined in 23 CFR §771.135(p), the “use” of a protected Section 4(f) resource occurs when:

- (1) land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility through partial or full acquisition (i.e., “direct use”);
- (2) there is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the preservationist purposes of Section 4(f) (i.e., “temporary use”); or
- (3) there is no permanent incorporation of land, but the proximity of a transportation facility results in impacts so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired (i.e., “constructive use”).

□ Direct Use

A direct use of a Section 4(f) resource takes place when property is permanently incorporated into a proposed transportation project. This may occur as a result of partial or full acquisition of a fee simple interest, permanent easements, or temporary easements that exceed regulatory limits noted below (*see* 23 CFR §771.135(p)(7)).

□ Temporary Use

A temporary use of a Section 4(f) resource occurs when there is a temporary occupancy of property that is considered adverse in terms of the preservationist purposes of the Section 4(f) statute. Under the FTA/FHWA regulations, a temporary occupancy of property does not constitute a use of a Section 4(f) resource when the following conditions are satisfied: (1) the occupancy must be of temporary duration (i.e., shorter than the period of construction) and not involve a change in ownership of the property; (2) the scope of work must be minor, with only minimal changes to the protected resource; (3) there are no permanent adverse physical effects on the protected resource, nor will there be temporary or permanent interference with activities or purpose of the resource; (4) the property being used must be fully restored to a condition that is at least as good as that which existed prior to the proposed project; and (5) there must be documented agreement of the appropriate officials having jurisdiction over the resource regarding the foregoing requirements.

□ Constructive Use

A constructive use of a Section 4(f) resource happens when a transportation project does not permanently incorporate land from the resource, but the proximity of the project results in impacts (i.e., noise, vibration, visual, access, and/or ecological impacts) so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment occurs only if the protected activities, features, or attributes of the resource are substantially diminished. This determination is made through: (1) identification of the current activities, features, or attributes of the resource that may be sensitive to proximity impacts; (2) analysis of the potential proximity impacts on the resource; and (3) consultation with the appropriate officials having jurisdiction over the resource.

6-2 PROPOSED ACTION

The Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project (proposed project) would extend bi-directional railroad tracks from the existing stub-end yard track configuration at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) to the south and east to provide “run-through” capabilities for four of the ten stub-end tracks at LAUS. The extension would involve construction of a railroad bridge span over the El Monte Busway and the U.S. 101 freeway. The elevated rail structure would continue south then east between Commercial Street and Ducommun Street from U.S. 101 to the vicinity of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) West Bank Yard, where the tracks would transition to grade and reconnect to the existing Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) mainline tracks (north of 1st Street) along the west bank of the Los Angeles River.

The purpose of and need for the proposed project, as well as descriptions of the proposed project alternatives (including the No-Build Alternative), are provided in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of this Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS).

Figure 6-1 depicts the project location.

6-3 DESCRIPTION OF SECTION 4(f) PROPERTIES

As noted above in Section 6-1.1, properties subject to Section 4(f) consideration include publicly owned lands of a public park/recreation area; a wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance; or an historic site of national, state, or local significance, whether publicly or privately owned. For purposes of this Section 4(f) evaluation, only those resources within about ½ mile of the proposed project have been identified for additional analysis. These resources are described below.


6-3.1 Public Parks and Recreation Areas

Four public parks/recreation areas are located within ½ mile of the proposed project. City Hall Park Center is located at 200 North Main Street in Los Angeles. El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Monument is located at 622 North Main Street in Los Angeles. Pecan Park is located at 120 Gless Street. Alpine Park is located at 817 Yale Street.

Table 6-1 provides summary descriptions of each public park.


Figure 6-2 shows the locations of the public park and recreation areas in relation to the proposed project.

Because three of the four public park and recreation areas are approximately ½ mile away from the proposed project, and the fourth is about ⅓ mile away, the likelihood of any adverse proximity effects is very low. No permanent acquisition of land from the public park and recreation resources would occur, nor would any temporary occupancy of land be necessary. The distance between these resources and the proposed project is sufficient to ensure that no direct, temporary, or indirect proximity impacts would result. Consequently, these resources have not been carried forward for additional Section 4(f) evaluation.



Source: U.S. Census TIGER Data, 1995; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 6-1: Project Location



Source: ©2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2003; Myra L. Frank / Jones & Stokes, 2004.

Figure 6-2: Location of Section 4(f) Public Parks/Recreation Areas

Table 6-1: Description of Section 4(f) Properties—Public Parks/Recreation Areas

| Map # | Name | Location | Distance from Project |
|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | City Hall Park Center | 200 North Main Street | 0.5 mi |
| 2 | El Pueblo de Los Angeles | 622 North Main Street | 0.3 mi |
| 3 | Pecan Park | 120 Gless Street | 0.5 mi |
| 4 | Alpine Park | 817 Yale Street | 0.5 mi |

Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc. (2003).

6-3.2 Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges

No wildlife or waterfowl refuges subject to Section 4(f) have been identified in the project area.

6-3.3 Historic Sites

Several significant historic sites have been identified in the project area. As documented in Section 3-5, Cultural Resources, of this EIR/EIS and the associated cultural resources technical studies for the project (i.e., Historic Resource Evaluation Report, Historic Property Survey Report, and Archaeological Survey Report), numerous data sources and research methods were employed in order to identify these historic resources.

A records and literature search was conducted to determine the proximity of previously documented prehistoric and historical archaeological resources to the Area of Potential Effects (APE) and help establish a context for resource significance. Topographic maps, geologic information, and Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps of Los Angeles were also reviewed. In addition, available local, regional, and railroad histories were consulted. Finally, an archaeological field reconnaissance of the project APE was undertaken.

A background research survey was undertaken to determine and identify the proximity of previously documented historic and architectural resources within and near the APE and help establish a context for resource significance. National, state, and local inventories of architectural/historic resources were examined in order to identify significant local historical events and personages, development patterns, and unique interpretations of architectural styles. During 2002, several qualified architectural historians made field surveys of all properties within the APE in accordance with standard Section 106 guidelines and related procedures. During the field investigations, the boundaries of the APE were confirmed, and an assessment was made of all extant buildings and structures within the APE to determine if their age and integrity warranted application of National Register criteria.

Table 6-2 provides a summary description of the significant historic sites in the project area. Comprehensive descriptions of each resource are detailed in Section 3-5, Cultural Resources, of the EIR/EIS and the cultural resources technical studies.

Figure 6-3a and Figure 6-3b illustrate the locations of the identified significant historic properties in relation to the proposed project.


Table 6-2: Description of Section 4(f) Properties—Significant Historic Sites

| Map # | Name | Location | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Historic and Architectural Properties</i> | | | |
| 1a | Union Station—terminal buildings, passenger platforms, canopies, tracks | 800 North Alameda Street | National Register – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed 11/13/80 City of LA Monument – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated 08/02/72 |
| 1b | Union Station—Terminal Tower | 413 Bauchet Street | |
| 1c | Macy Street Undercrossing | APN # 5409-023-926 | |
| 1d | Vignes Street Undercrossing | APN # 5409-015-906 | |
| 1e | Car Supply/Repair Shop | 900 Block of Avila Street | |
| 2 | 1 st Street Viaduct | 1 st Street (between Santa Fe Avenue and Mission Road) | National Register – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined Eligible, 1986 California Department of Transportation Bridge Survey |
| 3 | AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices | 2550 Butte Street | National Register – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined Eligible 1984 [1994] Alameda Corridor Project |
| 4 | Mission Tower | 1436 Alhambra Avenue | National Register – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially Eligible, 2003 LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project |
| <i>Prehistoric and Historical Archaeological Properties</i> | | | |
| 5 | CA-LAN-1575/H | South of Cesar Chavez Avenue, west of Vignes Street, north of U.S.101, and east of Alameda Street | National Register – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined Eligible, 1989 Metro Red Line Project |
| 6 | AE-UPT-01 (Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Siding) | Commercial Street at Garvey Street and Hewitt Street | National Register – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially Eligible, 2003 LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project |

Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc. (2003).

Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Evaluation

Los Angeles Union Station
Area of Potential Effects Map
Map 3



1. Mission Tower, 1432 Alhambra Ave, Year Built: 1916; Enlarged: 1938
2. Terminal Tower, 413 Baughet St., Year Built: 1938
3. Vignes Street Undercrossing, Bridge #53C-1764, Year Built: 1937
4. Macy Street Undercrossing, Bridge #53C-131, Year Built: 1931
5. Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal, 800 Alameda St., Year Built: 1939
6. Highway 101 Bridge over the Los Angeles River, Bridge #53-005, Year Built: 1944; Altered: 1955
7. Amay's Bakery & Noodle Company, 837 Commercial St, Year Built: 1938-1944
8. New York Junk Company, 825 Commercial St., Year Built: 1946
9. Friedman Bag Co. - Textile Division, 801-817 Commercial St., Year Built: 1902; 1906; 1941
10. Thomas R. Barrabee Store and Warehouse, 611-615 Ducommun St., Year Built: 1926
11. Friedman Bag Co. - Storage Building, 500 Garey St., Year Built: 1935
12. Los Angeles Casing Co., 710-714 Ducommun St., Year Built: 1900
13. LAUSD District 11 Facilities Services and Maintenance Shop, 611 Jackson St., Year Built: 1937
14. First Street Viaduct over the Los Angeles River, Bridge #53C-1166, Year Built: 1929
15. Car Supply/Repair Shop, 800 Block Avila Street, Year Built: 1939

AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS
Los Angeles Union Station Project
Los Angeles County, California
Calltrans No. (PM) 07-LA-10-HP 0.89
EA 633034

FHWA Transportation Engineer _____ Date _____
Calltrans District _____
Environmental Branch Chief _____ Date _____

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) boundary for the proposed project includes the area within the maximum required right-of-way, easements (temporary and permanent), all easements (temporary and permanent), and areas where visual or audible changes could occur outside the required right-of-way. North of Union Station, the APE follows the railroad Right of Way until joining into the east of Mission Junction.



Sources: City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2002-2003.

Figure 6-3a: Location of Section 4(f) Significant Historic Sites



Source: Imagecat, Inc., 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, 2003.

--- Area of Potential Effects Boundary



Figure 6-3b: Location of Section 4(f) Significant Historic Sites

6-4 IMPACTS TO SECTION 4(f) PROPERTIES

The following sections describe how the proposed project would affect Section 4(f) properties. A summary of potential effects from the proposed project on these properties is provided in Table 6-3. Additional analysis then follows for each property. In every instance, an assessment has been made as to whether any permanent or temporary occupation of a property would occur and whether the proximity of the project would cause any access disruption, noise, vibration, or aesthetic impacts that would substantially impair the features or attributes that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f).

| Table 6-3: Effects on Section 4(f) Properties—Significant Historic Sites | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-------|--------|---|
| Map No. | Name | Section 4(f) Use? | | | Remarks |
| | | Direct | Temp. | Const. | |
| <i>Historic and Architectural Properties</i> | | | | | |
| 1a | Union Station—terminal buildings, passenger platforms, canopies, tracks | N/A | N/A | N/A | Excluded from Section 4(f) (Sec. 106 - No adverse effect) |
| 1b | Union Station—Terminal Tower | N/A | N/A | N/A | Excluded from Section 4(f) (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| 1c | Macy Street Undercrossing | N/A | N/A | N/A | Excluded from Section 4(f) (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| 1d | Vignes Street Undercrossing | N/A | N/A | N/A | Excluded from Section 4(f) (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| 1e | Car Supply/Repair Shop | N/A | N/A | N/A | Excluded from Section 4(f) (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| 2 | 1 st Street Viaduct | No | No | No | (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| 3 | AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices | No | No | No | (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| 4 | Mission Tower | No | No | No | (Sec. 106 – No effect) |
| <i>Prehistoric and Historical Archaeological Properties</i> | | | | | |
| 5 | CA-LAN-1575/H | Maybe | Maybe | No | Sec. 106 – Potential adv. effect |
| 6 | AE-UPT-01 (AT&SF RR Siding) | Maybe | Maybe | No | Sec. 106 – Potential adv. effect |

Source: Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc. (2003).

6-4.1 Historic Properties with No Section 4(f) Use

The proposed project would result in no direct, temporary, or constructive use of the following three significant historic properties protected by Section 4(f).

6-4.1.1 1st Street Viaduct

a. Description and Significance of the Property

The 1st Street Viaduct (Department bridge number 53C-1166) was built in 1929 with Neoclassical details. It carries vehicular traffic over the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) tracks, Los Angeles River, and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks. The designer was Merrill Butler, and the contractor was Mittrey Bros. Construction Company. The bridge is 71 feet wide, with 28 spans, and reaches a length of 1,300 feet. The reinforced concrete bridge features an open spandrel elliptical 125-foot arch. It was determined eligible for the National Register as a result of the 1986 Department Bridge Survey.

b. Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

The proposed project would involve track realignments, grade changes, and the construction of a Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) wall near the bridge. Proposed construction would take place to the north of, and would include track work partly under, the 1st Street Viaduct. No physical alteration to the 1st Street Viaduct itself would occur. The MSE wall, which is part of the proposed project's trestle segment, would start 75 feet north (for Alignment A) or 150 feet north (for Alignment A-1) from the 1st Street Viaduct. The MSE wall would begin at a height of approximately 4 feet and rise to a maximum of 25 feet. The width ranges from 35 feet to 45 feet to accommodate two tracks. Other construction would involve lowering existing BNSF yard tracks and the Amtrak lead track to gain clearance where the trestle crosses over the existing tracks. The tracks for the proposed project would reach grade level of the BNSF yard under the 1st Street Viaduct, with a clearance to the bridge of approximately 20 feet.

Since the 1st Street Viaduct property does not include the air space beneath it or the underlying track and ballast area, the proposed project modifications located there would not be considered to be a permanent or temporary occupancy of protected Section 4(f) property. In addition, the BNSF tracks, ties, and ballast constitute "physical features within the setting" of the 1st Street Viaduct, but they have been subject to regular replacement over the years as part of routine maintenance and are not historic material that contribute to the significance of the 1st Street Viaduct.

Effects related to the proximity of the proposed project to the 1st Street Viaduct would not be adverse and would not substantially impair the historic qualities and character that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). Atmospheric and audible elements would continue to be generated by train traffic under and vehicular traffic over the 1st Street Viaduct, with no demonstrable change from current conditions. The visual introduction of the MSE wall would start 75 feet north of the 1st Street Bridge for Alignment A or 150 feet north of the 1st Street Viaduct for Alignment A-1, where it would be only 4 feet high at those distances. The MSE wall would carry rail traffic, which is consistent with the visual character and historic uses in this area of the setting of the 1st Street Bridge. Therefore, the introduction of the MSE wall would not diminish the integrity of the 1st Street Viaduct's significant historic features, which are the materials, design, and workmanship of the reinforced concrete bridge structure.

c. Coordination/Consultation

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that no direct, temporary, or constructive use of the 1st Street Viaduct property would result from the proposed project.

6-4.1.2 AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices

a. Description and Significance of the Property

The AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices (AT&SF Offices) are located at 2550 Butte Street. They were previously determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places in 1994 as a result of the Section 106 compliance process for the Alameda Corridor Improvement Project. The AT&SF Offices were found eligible as part of the AT&SF Redondo Junction/Butte Street Yard District under criteria A and C at the local level of significance but also appear eligible for the National Register on an individual basis, with a period of significance of 1920.

b. Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

The AT&SF Offices would be located approximately 50 feet to the rear of the proposed new Amtrak mail transfer facility, the operations of which would be relocated from Union Station as part of the proposed project. The proposed new mail facility would not involve either permanent or temporary occupancy of the property on which the AT&SF Offices are situated, and no physical alteration to the AT&SF Offices would occur.

Effects related to the proximity of the proposed project to the AT&SF Offices would not be adverse and would not substantially impair the historic qualities and character that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). The AT&SF Offices are set well back from Washington Street, in an area with railroad and industrial character. The proposed Amtrak mail transfer facility would be constructed between the AT&SF Offices and Washington Street and would obscure some views of the building. Views to the building from within its railroad yard setting from the Redondo Junction Tower and site of the former AT&SF Roundhouse would remain unobstructed and unaffected by the construction of the Amtrak mail transfer facility. The railroad setting would not be affected, and views to the building from within its historic yard setting would not be obstructed. Access to the AT&SF Offices would not be disrupted.

c. Coordination/Consultation

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that no direct, temporary, or constructive use of the AT&SF Offices property would result from the proposed project.

6-4.1.3 Mission Tower

a. Description and Significance of the Property

Mission Tower is located on a flat site at 1436 Alhambra Avenue, on the western bank of the Los Angeles River. Accessed only after security clearance through a wire gate, the isolated tower is situated about ¼ mile from Union Station, near the historic intersection of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Union Pacific Railroad, and Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. Historically, Mission Tower operated in conjunction with another signal tower, the Terminal Tower, to control railroad traffic in and out of Union Station. Mission Tower is a three-story and basement concrete tower, measuring 15 feet by 30 feet, with three separate entrances. There is no interior access, for security purposes. The architectural style of Mission Tower suggests Spanish Colonial Revival influences, with its tile roof and closed eaves, which are characteristically extended for railroad tower visibility. Incised lettering spells "Mission Tower" on the northern and southern façades.

Mission Tower was constructed by the Santa Fe Railway in 1916 and later enlarged in 1938. It replaced an earlier Santa Fe tower at Mission Junction, which had been constructed in 1894. Mission Tower is located outside the National Register boundary of Union Station but was closely associated with the construction and operation of Union Station after it was enlarged in 1938. Mission Tower appears eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for its association with the development and operations of the Santa Fe Railway in Los Angeles and its association with Union Station. Mission Tower also appears eligible under Criterion C as an example of a Spanish Colonial Revival railroad switching tower, which exhibits a high degree of architectural quality for this type of property and has retained a high degree of all aspects of integrity from its period of significance, 1938.

b. Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

No physical alteration to Mission Tower would occur as a result of the proposed project. In addition, no construction or track work for the proposed project would be done in the area near Mission Tower. The proposed project tracks would return to grade and be joined with existing tracks in the throat area before reaching Alhambra Avenue and well before reaching the Mission

Tower area. Mission Tower was taken out of service in 1996, and the construction and implementation of the proposed project would not affect its current use.

Effects related to the proximity of the proposed project to Mission Tower would not be adverse and would not substantially impair the historic qualities and character that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). Rail operations in this area would continue in a manner not unlike the present, with the expected noise, vibration, and visual characteristics of such activities. Access to Mission Tower, already controlled for security purposes, would not be disrupted.

c. Coordination/Consultation

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that no direct, temporary, or constructive use of the protected Mission Tower property would result from the proposed project.

6-4.2 Historic Properties Excluded from Section 4(f)

FRA and the Department have applied the regulations at 23 CFR §771.135(f) to five historic properties affected by the proposed project. Application of this section of the regulations allows FRA to determine that these historic properties are excluded from Section 4(f) consideration. The properties would be excluded because they are existing transportation facilities that are on or eligible for the National Register, and they would be subject to restoration, rehabilitation, or maintenance work with no adverse effects resulting to their historic qualities. The provisions of 23 CFR §771.135(f) are as follows:

“The Administration may determine that section 4(f) requirements do not apply to restoration, rehabilitation, or maintenance of transportation facilities that are on or eligible for the National Register when:

- (1) Such work will not adversely affect the historic qualities of the facility that caused it to be on or eligible for the National Register; and*
- (2) The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) have been consulted and do not object to the finding in paragraph (f)(1) of this section.”*

Provided below are descriptions of the historic properties that appear eligible for exclusion from Section 4(f) consideration, as well as an explanation of how the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) have been satisfied for each property.

The five properties subject to exclusion from Section 4(f) are part of the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal (Union Station) complex at 800 North Alameda Street. Union Station was listed in the National Register on November 13, 1980, and was designated as City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument 101 on August 2, 1972. The city monument boundary includes the passenger terminal building, attached service buildings, and the parking lots along Alameda Street but excludes the appurtenant railroad tracks along the east side that contribute to the National Register listing. Union Station was documented in the Historic American Buildings Survey, Survey Number HABS CA 2-258-A. The five major buildings and structures discussed below are located within the property boundary of Union Station indicated on the National Register nomination.

6-4.2.1 Union Station Terminal Buildings, Passenger Platforms, Canopies, and Tracks

a. Description and Significance of the Property

The National Register nomination form for Union Station specifically identified the main buildings that compose the station terminal, along with its associated service areas and passenger platforms, canopies, and tracks. Union Station is considered significant both for its historical association with the development of railroad transportation in the United States and for the quality of its architectural design. Built from 1934 through 1939, Union Station is considered the last grand railroad station constructed in the United States. Its construction resulted in the consolidation of local passenger operations among the Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, and Santa Fe railroads.

Union Station's architectural design by consulting architects John and Donald Parkinson, Union Pacific's R.J. Wirth, Southern Pacific's J.H. Christie, and Santa Fe's H.L. Gilman blended the Spanish Colonial Revival style with the Streamline Moderne style. This unique blend of historic and modern styles at once reflected both the historic character of Los Angeles and the evolution of railroad technology from steam to diesel power. John Parkinson, one of Los Angeles' most prominent architects in the early 20th century, is largely responsible for the design of many of the city's most identifiable landmarks, including the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum, City Hall, Bullock's Wilshire, and many of the commercial buildings in the Spring Street Historic District.

The National Register nomination form devoted the vast majority of its discussion to the description and significance of the main passenger terminal buildings, but the boundary included the entire property. The nomination does describe some character-defining features within the APE, including service areas and pedestrian platforms, canopies, ramps, and tunnels, as follows, quoted in relevant part:

“Also in the upper level, and over the pedestrian islands between the railroad tracks, are Y-shaped sheds consisting of corrugated-iron panels supported by steel columns, both of which are badly rusted and in need of cleaning and painting. These sheds provide protection from the sun and the rain and are expected to continue to be needed as long as the tracks are used for passenger trains.”

The facilities above described have no special aesthetic value and are historical only to the extent that they served a utilitarian function as part of the overall station, when it was in full operation. However, their location is such that any new development that takes place in their vicinity needs to be carefully designed so as to blend in with the significant portion of the station, both aesthetically and functionally. That is the main reason they have been included in the nomination...

Santa Fe favored [the design of] a through terminal; the Union Station plan, however, was to create a stub-end terminal with all three lines [Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, and Santa Fe] consolidated on a short, dead-end trackage system. The operational disadvantages of utilizing this type of system was a major objection of the railroad companies. The stub-end system created an end-of-the-line station with the tracks ending at bumpers...The LAUPT plan placed the main passenger terminal building at the side of the stub-end track network, with a series of ramps and an underground passage connecting the platforms with the waiting room...

The three major railroad lines were brought together over a set of throat tracks, with a carefully designed arrangement of turn-outs, cross-overs and double slip switches which permitted trains of each company to be routed to any track in the station at any time. The trains were shunted onto 16 tracks. Eight double ramps lead from the platforms to a subterranean tunnel which leads to the main waiting room...

The main architectural focus of the complex is the passenger station itself. The support facilities for baggage and parcel shipment immediately behind it are more utilitarian in appearance. The terminal complex is bordered by retaining walls on the north and south sides which reflect the Art Deco influences in the 1930's design... The 500-foot pedestrian subway connects the main terminal building with the tracks; it is integrated structurally and visually into the design, using linear bands of subdued colors to unite the two areas...Light fixtures of the 1930's period are placed in the ceiling leading to the eight sets of double ramps rising to the platforms between the tracks; the platforms are surmounted by the original butterfly sheds."

Three key points drawn from the National Register nomination for Union Station should be emphasized:

1. The main passenger terminal buildings are the character-defining features from which the significance of Union Station is derived and recognized.
2. A run-through, or double-end, track design was originally considered when Union Station was being planned in the 1930s.
3. The passenger platforms and canopies were considered to have "no aesthetic value" and were mainly included so that "any new development that takes place in their vicinity needs to be

carefully designed so as to blend in with the significant portion of the station, both aesthetically and functionally.”

b. Proposed Work and Its Effects

The proposed project includes work that would occur on or adjacent to the Union Station National Register-listed property, including track and platform changes, passenger accessibility improvements, and a bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The proposed work and its effects on the property are described below, followed by an assessment of how the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) for exclusion from Section 4(f) have been satisfied.

❑ Demolition of Platform Nos. 7 and 8 – North Portion

Decommissioned Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would be reconstructed and Tracks 14 through 16 would be reinstalled and reactivated for passenger rail use. The southern passenger access ramps for Platform Nos. 7 and 8 that were removed by 1991 would be reconstructed to match the existing southern ramps of Platform Nos. 2 through 6. The original northern passenger access ramps and railings remain; however, these would also be demolished and reconstructed to match the existing ADA-compliant southern ramps. The demolition of the northern ramps and railings at Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would result in a potentially adverse effect under Section 106 and a direct use under Section 4(f) because it would result in demolition of historic materials that date to the 1939 period of significance of the National Register-listed property. At the same time, however, the reactivation of passenger rail service to currently decommissioned Platform Nos. 7 and 8 would be a beneficial effect on the historic property because it would restore the historic function of these decommissioned platforms and tracks. If the northern ramps and railings are reconstructed according to the Secretary’s Standards in the new ADA-compliant configuration, this mitigation, coupled with the beneficial effect resulting from the reactivation of passenger rail service, would reduce the effect on Platform Nos. 7 and 8 to “no adverse” under Section 106. This finding supports a conclusion that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

❑ Alteration of Platform Nos. 2 and 3

Platform Nos. 2 and 3, serving Tracks 3 through 6, would be elevated approximately five feet as part of the proposed project. The process of raising Platform Nos. 2 and 3 could substantially alter the visual experience of passengers arriving or departing from other platforms at Union Station. The passenger’s viewpoint at Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be unchanged when a train pulls in because the relative distance of the platform and canopy from the train and tracks would remain unchanged; they would be vertically shifted as a unit. Existing views toward the Union Station terminal building and tower from Platform Nos. 4 through 6 may be partially obscured due to the increased height of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and the associated passenger access ramp railings, display signs, and benches. However, these views have already been partially obscured due to the recent reconstruction of Platform No. 1 for the new Gold Line service, which was raised above grade by approximately 2 to 3 feet. The views toward the station from Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be fairly unobstructed and perhaps slightly better than existing conditions

due to their increased height. The only objects that could obstruct sight lines to the station from Platform Nos. 2 and 3 are the Gold Line waiting shelter, light poles, elevator, catenary wires, and other structures located on the Gold Line Platform No. 1. Because the overall passenger experience would be unchanged, and because the Gold Line has already introduced elevated platforms and elevated guideway at Platform No. 1, the visual change of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 being placed at an elevated height in comparison to other platforms would result in a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106. This finding supports a conclusion that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

A second alteration to the existing configuration of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would occur at the southern end of the platform area. Here the platforms would be slightly curved in a southeasterly direction to follow the curved track alignment and approach to the proposed bridge across the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The MTA Gold Line has already introduced an elevated curved guideway at the north end of Platform No. 1 and will be constructing an elevated curved guideway at the south end of Platform No. 1, which also would approach a new bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. Because the south ends of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 were rebuilt for the Red Line in 1991, and because of the existing and proposed Gold Line curved guideways, the alteration of the original design of the south ends of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 from straight to curved would result in a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106. This finding supports a conclusion that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

□ Alteration of Butterfly Canopies

As part of the proposed project, the corrugated metal butterfly canopies on Platform Nos. 2 and 3 would be disassembled for cleaning and either reinstalled or replaced after construction of the new raised platforms would be completed. The canopies over Platform Nos. 4 through 6 may also be handled in a similar manner. The butterfly canopies on Platform No. 2 were completely removed during construction of the Red Line, and although some of the removed sections were discarded, the existing sections were reinstalled and filled in where necessary, most likely with original sections of canopy that had been previously removed from Platform Nos. 7 and 8. Some of the canopies contain small sections of new corrugated metal cladding. These sections were installed in kind and appear to have been done in accordance with the Secretary’s Standards.

The proposed project calls for the canopy over Platform No. 2 to be extended on the north by approximately 135 feet and approximately 22 feet on the south. The canopy over Platform No. 3 would be extended on the north by approximately 58 feet and by approximately 22 feet on the south. The canopies over Platform Nos. 4 through 6 will be extended on the north and on the south almost to the extent of the end of the platforms. Although the extension of the canopies would be an alteration from its existing condition, the canopies were previously shortened, so the extension would restore the portions of the canopies previously removed. As long as the extension is done in accordance with the Secretary’s Standards, it would result in a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106. This finding supports a conclusion that the proposed

project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

□ Alteration of Service Road

As part of the proposed project, a set of stairs would be constructed at the southern end of Platform Nos. 2 through 6 to access the proposed lower level and depressed baggage road and baggage storage area. The alteration of the service road by the introduction of the stairs and lower level would change the spatial relationship between the service road and the tracks and would not be compatible with the original design of the service road. However, the original service road was demolished, shifted to the north, and realigned on an angle in 1987 as a result of the construction of the El Monte Busway. Because of these changes, the service road does not have integrity of location, materials, design, or workmanship dating to 1939. It does have integrity of setting, feeling, and association because it is still at grade and it maintains its relationship to the south end of the tracks. Since the service road was moved and rebuilt in 1987, the further alteration of the service road design would result in a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106. This finding supports a conclusion that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

□ Alteration of South Retaining Wall

The proposed project would require alteration of the South Retaining Wall along the south end of the Union Station property by removing a portion of the balustrade to accommodate the bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The South Retaining Wall was demolished, shifted to the north, and realigned on an angle in 1987 as a result of the construction of the El Monte Busway; therefore, it does not have integrity of location, materials, or workmanship dating to 1939. It does have integrity of design, setting, feeling, and association because it was reconstructed to replicate the original appearance in accordance with a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement. Because the South Retaining Wall was moved and rebuilt in 1987, the further alteration of the South Retaining Wall and balustrade in accordance with the Secretary’s Standards would result in a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106. This finding supports a conclusion that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

The proposed project would also introduce a major visual change in the vicinity of the South Retaining Wall by construction of a bridge through the balustrade and over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The MTA Gold Line Eastside Extension project includes a bridge that will have similar impacts. Since it will be constructed first, the Gold Line extension will establish a precedent for the bridge. In addition, a double-end, or through-terminal, design for Union Station was considered back in the 1930s, which means such a bridge would be in keeping with an alternative historic design. Because the South Retaining Wall was moved and rebuilt in 1987, and because the Gold Line is planning to construct a similar bridge at this location before the proposed project, the visual change caused by the bridge from the original South Retaining Wall design would result in a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106. This finding

supports a conclusion that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of this portion of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

Application of Section 4(f) Exclusion Criteria

□ No Adverse Effect to Historic Qualities of the Transportation Facility

As demonstrated in the foregoing analysis, the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be listed on the National Register. The overall effects on the National Register-listed Union Station historic property caused by the proposed project would for the most part be limited to various isolated elements of the platform and track area and would include demolition and alteration of portions of the passenger platforms and ramps, canopies, south retaining wall, and baggage service road. Many of these elements were demolished and reconstructed after the 1980 National Register listing of the property. Some historic materials from the 1939 period of significance would be affected by the proposed project, but treatment of this fabric would be done in consultation with the SHPO to minimize harm to the overall historic property. The proposed project would also cause a change in the visual and spatial relationships among platforms and could affect views of the terminal building and tower from some platforms. Such visual changes would not substantially alter the passenger experience within the entire historic transportation facility.

None of the changes resulting from the proposed project would directly or indirectly affect the main Union Station terminal building, arcades, patios, or landscaping, the primary buildings for which the property was found to be eligible for the National Register. These changes also would not adversely affect the overall experience of rail passenger service at Union Station, the property's historic use. The changes would not by themselves or as a group diminish the integrity of the property such as to compromise its National Register eligibility. Therefore, these changes to isolated elements would result in a finding of "no adverse effect" under Section 106 for the entire National Register-listed property. This finding of "no adverse effect" for the entire property supports a similar conclusion for purposes of 23 CFR §771.135(f) that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the National Register-listed transportation facility and should, therefore, be excluded from Section 4(f) consideration.

□ Beneficial Effect to Historic Qualities of the Transportation Facility

In addition to fact that the proposed project would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be listed on the National Register, there would likely be beneficial effects to the property and its historic character. Most important of these benefits would be that rail passenger service would continue and be enhanced at Union Station, thereby reinforcing its reemergence as the primary rail transportation center for the Southern California region. This continuing function as a train station is perhaps the most important historic character-defining feature of Union Station, and it represents a rare situation today considering how many historic railroad stations across the nation have been put out of service or converted to other uses.

The proposed project can also be considered beneficial to the historic qualities of Union Station insofar as it is consistent with historical plans for a through station rather than a stub-end station. As noted earlier, the National Register nomination form stated that a run-through, or double-end, track design was originally considered when Union Station was being planned in the 1930s.

c. Coordination/Consultation – SHPO and ACHP

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no adverse effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that (1) the proposed restoration, rehabilitation, and/or maintenance work on the Union Station terminal buildings, passenger platforms, canopies, and tracks would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be on the National Register and that (2) the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) for exclusion of this historic transportation facility from further Section 4(f) consideration have been met.

6-4.2.2 LAUPT Tower – (Terminal Tower)

a. Description and Significance of the Property

Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal Tower (Terminal Tower) served the Union Pacific Railroad, AT&SF Railway, and Southern Pacific Railroad as a consolidated interlocking tower. It is located on a raised parcel at 413 Bauchet Street, east of the throat of the Union Station railroad lead tracks. The building is accessed by a steep drive and enclosed by chain-link fencing, opposite a security guard station. The tower is a three-story with basement concrete building, measuring 24 feet by 58 feet. Constructed in 1938 in concert with Union Station, its clay tile roof reflects the Spanish Colonial Revival influences of the main depot, despite being an essentially industrial building. The roof has a wide overhang with closed eaves, which are characteristically extended for improved tower visibility. Windows are double-hung with wired glass on the first and second floor.

Terminal Tower performed an integral function as part of the historical operations of Union Station. For nearly 60 years, signal engineers in the tower monitored railroad traffic in and out of Union Station, in coordination with Mission Tower. From their third-floor location, engineers, with the interlocking beds in front of them, controlled a series of levers and switches, directing the trains to their appropriate destinations. In 1996, SCRRA closed the tower, and now it is used for maintenance and storage.

While Terminal Tower was included within the National Register boundary, it was not specifically identified as a contributing feature. The National Register nomination stated: "The Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal complex is significant in the history of transportation in Los Angeles, the state, and the nation. Its integrated design reflects the historical evolution through years of litigation to consolidate three major railroads into a single terminal complex. In

addition, the main passenger terminal building remains one of the great architectural statements of its time."

As an integral part of the Union Station complex, Terminal Tower is a contributing feature, and within the boundary, of the National Register-listed property.

b. Proposed Works and Its Effects

Terminal Tower is located just east of the "throat area" of the Union Station railroad tracks. The reconstruction of the throat area, conducted as part of the proposed project, would involve removing the existing track, constructing new prefabricated sturdy track, and installing double slip switches, rail ties, and crushed rock. Railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast are typically replaced as part of routine maintenance. These elements in the throat area of Union Station are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the early 1990s following construction of the Metro Red Line subway and station. There would be no grade changes in the track area near Terminal Tower.

The proposed project would not change the present use or otherwise alter Terminal Tower in any way. The proposed project would result in some changes to its setting, but this would be limited to the replacement of nonhistoric railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast. Accordingly, this work would not be considered to have an adverse effect on the historic qualities that qualified this transportation facility for listing on the National Register. This finding is supported by the Section 106 process for the proposed project, which has determined that the proposed project would have "no effect" on this historic property.

c. Coordination/Consultation – SHPO and ACHP

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of "no effect" under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that (1) the proposed restoration, rehabilitation, and/or maintenance work on the Union Station Terminal Tower would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be on the National Register and that (2) the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) for exclusion of this historic transportation facility from further Section 4(f) consideration have been met.

6-4.2.3 Union Station – Macy Street Undercrossing

a. Description and Significance of the Property

The Macy Street Undercrossing (now Cesar Chavez Avenue Undercrossing, Department Bridge No. 53C-131) carries vehicular traffic under the Union Station tracks. Its main span is a

reinforced-concrete, earth-filled, elliptical 68-foot-long arch. The bridge is 56 feet wide, with one span 30 feet long. It allows for four lanes of traffic to pass underneath the arch span. It features an arched-window rail, with rough concrete texture. Its design is very similar to the Vignes Street Bridge and retaining walls at Union Station.

The Macy Street Undercrossing was designed by Merrill Butler and constructed in 1931 by the Bent Brothers. During a career at the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering that spanned four decades, Merrill Butler (1891-1963) supervised the construction of more than 200 bridges. Merrill Butler came to the Bureau of Engineering in 1923 at the height of the City Beautiful movement and during a time when the City of Los Angeles was busily constructing bridges and viaducts to move people, goods, and utilities more efficiently through the city. The bridges he designed reflect the building styles that were popular at the time, using architectural elements to distinguish these bridges from one another and create gateways for new and existing communities throughout the growing city. Many of these styles were manipulated to accommodate the needs of these bridge spans, and some bridges show evidence of overlapping styles or mixed styles.

Merrill Butler designed many significant bridges during his tenure at the Bureau of Engineering. Fifteen have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, of which 12 are river crossings. Six of these bridges are listed locally as Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments. These bridges are among a large group that is considered the best examples of river crossings from the period 1923–1961 in California, as well as the United States. Butler considered them his second most important accomplishment, after the Hyperion Sewage Treatment Plant. Within the project APE, Merrill Butler also designed the Vignes Street Bridge under the Union Station tracks, as well as the 1st Street Bridge over the Los Angeles River.

The Macy Street Undercrossing is located to the northeast of the Union Station main terminal building and carries the multiple tracks and platforms of Union Station over Cesar Chavez Avenue before they become joined in the throat area.

As an integral part of the Union Station complex, the Macy Street Undercrossing is a contributing feature, and is within the boundary, of the National Register-listed property.

b. Proposed Work and Its Effects

As a result of the proposed project, Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 would be raised approximately 4 to 5 feet above the existing grade level above the deck of the Macy Street Undercrossing. This would accommodate the clearance of the proposed new run-through tracks over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. To raise the platforms and tracks up to this height, a lightweight engineered fill would be placed on top of the Macy Street Undercrossing along with associated retaining walls. There would be no structural changes to the Macy Street Undercrossing itself and no physical alteration to the structure below the surface of the deck. The railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast above the Macy Street Undercrossing are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the early 1990s following construction of the Metro Red Line subway and station.

The Macy Street Undercrossing would continue to carry Union Station train traffic over Cesar Chavez Avenue after the proposed project is completed. Therefore, there would be no change in the existing use of the property for transportation purposes. Although Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 may be considered “physical features within the setting” of the Macy Street Undercrossing, the changes to them would not be considered adverse since the work would affect only nonhistoric track and ballast materials and not the actual bridge structure. Atmospheric and audible elements would continue to be generated by train traffic over and vehicular traffic under the Macy Street Undercrossing, with no demonstrable change from current conditions. The elevation of Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and Tracks 3 through 6 by approximately 4 to 5 feet would result in the introduction of visual elements above the deck of the Macy Street Undercrossing (i.e., the retaining walls). However, the retaining walls would not be noticeable from most public vantage points, and their introduction would not diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features, which are the materials and design of the reinforced-concrete bridge structure. Thus, for all of the foregoing reasons, the work associated with the proposed project would not be considered to have an adverse effect on the historic qualities that qualified this transportation facility for listing on the National Register. This finding is supported by the Section 106 process for the proposed project, which has determined that the proposed project would have “no effect” on this historic property.

c. Coordination/Consultation – SHPO and ACHP

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that (1) the proposed restoration, rehabilitation, and/or maintenance work on the Macy Street Undercrossing would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be on the National Register and that (2) the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) for exclusion of this historic transportation facility from further Section 4(f) consideration have been met.

6-4.2.4 Union Station – Vignes Street Undercrossing

a. Description and Significance of the Property

The Vignes Street Undercrossing (Department bridge no. 53C-1764) carries vehicular traffic under the Union Station tracks. Its main span is a reinforced-concrete, earth-filled, elliptical 68-foot-long arch. The bridge is 30 feet wide, with one span 80 feet long. It allows for four lanes (originally two lanes) of traffic to pass underneath the arch span. It features an arched-window railing, with smooth concrete texture. Its design is very similar to the Macy Street Undercrossing and retaining walls at Union Station. The Vignes Street Undercrossing was designed by the City of Los Angeles (Merrill Butler) and constructed in 1937, concurrently with Union Station.

As an integral part of the Union Station complex, the Vignes Street Undercrossing is a contributing feature, and is within the boundary, of the National Register-listed property.

b. Proposed Work and Its Effects

The Vignes Street Undercrossing is located just north of Union Station’s throat area, where reconstruction of the rail connecting tracks would be done in stage 1 of construction. The proposed project would require tracks and switches in the throat area to be altered for reconstruction of Tracks 13 through 16 and, later, more efficient operation of all tracks. The reconstruction of the throat area involves removing some existing tracks and installing new tracks, double slip switches, rail ties, and crushed rock. Railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast are typically replaced as part of routine maintenance. Those in the throat area of Union Station are not historic materials because they were last replaced in the mid-1980s following construction of the Metro Red Line subway and station. There would be no grade changes in this area.

The proposed project would not change the present transportation use or otherwise alter the physical structure of the Vignes Street Undercrossing in any way. The proposed project would result in some changes to its setting, but this would be limited to the replacement of nonhistoric railroad tracks, switches, ties, and ballast carried above the bridge deck. Because the work associated with the proposed project would modify only the nonhistoric track and ballast materials and not the actual bridge structure, it would not be considered to have an adverse effect on the historic qualities that qualified this transportation facility for listing on the National Register. This finding is supported by the Section 106 process for the proposed project, which has determined that the proposed project would have “no effect” on this historic property.

c. Coordination/Consultation – SHPO and ACHP

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that (1) the proposed restoration, rehabilitation, and/or maintenance work on the Vignes Street Undercrossing would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be on the National Register and that (2) the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) for exclusion of this historic transportation facility from further Section 4(f) consideration have been met.

6-4.2.5 Union Station – Car Supply/Repair Shop

a. Description and Significance of the Property

The Car Supply/Repair Shop building was built in 1937 and is sited on a raised parcel at the northwest corner of Avila Street and Cesar E. Chavez Avenue (formerly Macy Street). The parcel terminates at the Macy Street Undercrossing. There is no access to the site from this intersection. Access to the building is from Vignes Street by way of Terminal Tower. The site is supported by an approximately 18-foot-high concrete retaining wall along both side streets. The building is one story in height and constructed of poured-in-place concrete. It is utilitarian in design and approximately 30 feet by 75 feet in size. Windows are metal awning type, and pedestrian entrances are located in the eastern and southern elevations with metal doors with half glazing. The building served a utilitarian function as part of the overall Union Station. The building continues to function as a support building for railroad operations.

The Car Supply/Repair Shop was constructed directly next to Track 17, a dedicated storage track at Union Station with no passenger access. This is where train car repairs and service could be made without disrupting passenger train service at Union Station. By the early 1980s Track 17 was removed and paved over with asphalt. Track numbers 14, 15, and 16, which were located just west of Track 17, also ran very near to the Car Supply/Repair Shop. In 1989–1991, as a result of the construction of the Metro Red Line station and tunnel, Tracks 14, 15, and 16 were removed and passenger Platforms Nos. 7 and 8 were decommissioned. Subsequently, Tracks 14, 15, and 16 were paved over and the current Amtrak mail facility was constructed on the northern sections of Platform Nos. 7 and 8. The paved area next to the Car Supply/Repair Shop serves as mail truck loading and parking and other vehicle parking.

As an integral part of the Union Station complex, the Car Supply/Repair Shop building is a contributing feature, and is within the boundary, of the National Register-listed property.

b. Proposed Works and Its Effects

The proposed project would involve the demolition of the current Amtrak mail facility, the reconstruction and reactivation of passenger Platform Nos. 7 and 8, and the reinstallation of Tracks 14, 15, and 16 for rail passenger service. These proposed changes would represent a return of the railroad use to this part of the platform and track area and would have a beneficial effect on the historic setting of the nearby Car Supply/Repair Shop. No physical alteration of the Car Supply/Repair Shop building itself would occur. Since the work associated with the proposed project would be beneficial to the setting of the Car Supply/Repair Shop building and would not otherwise modify the property, it would not be considered to have an adverse effect on the historic qualities that qualified this transportation facility for listing on the National Register. This finding is supported by the Section 106 process for the proposed project, which has determined that the proposed project would have “no effect” on this historic property.

c. Coordination/Consultation – SHPO and ACHP

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes. Concurrence from the SHPO has been obtained for a finding of “no effect” under Section 106.

d. Determination

FRA and the Department have determined that (1) the proposed restoration, rehabilitation, and/or maintenance work on the Union Station Car Supply/Repair Shop would not adversely affect the historic qualities of the transportation facility that caused it to be on the National Register and that (2) the requirements of 23 CFR §771.135(f) for exclusion of this historic transportation facility from further Section 4(f) consideration have been met.

6-4.3 Archaeological Sites with Potential Section 4(f) Use

The proposed project could potentially result in the direct and/or temporary use of two historic properties. Both properties are significant archaeological sites that could potentially be disturbed by the proposed project.

6-4.3.1 Archaeological Site CA-LAN-1575/H

a. Description and Significance of the Property

Multi-component archaeological site CA-LAN-1575/H encompasses the area surrounding Union Station south of Macy Street, west of Vignes Street, east of U.S. 101, and east of Alameda Street. This site was first recorded in 1989 in association with discoveries of historic-era cultural remains made during monitoring and excavation for the Metro Rail Project (Greenwood 1996). Materials recovered were associated with a ca.1860–1930s Chinatown. Artifacts included Chinese ceramics, glassware, jewelry, and faunal remains. Features found included structural remains such as building foundations, pipelines, ditches, and what are described as “hearths.”

Cultural materials were first extracted from the area recorded as CA-LAN-1575/H in 1980 in association with test bores designed to investigate subsurface soils and deposits along the alignment of the Los Angeles Downtown People Mover Project (Costello:1980). In 1989, portions of a human skeleton were unearthed. Later, in 1996, excavations at CA-LAN-1575/H for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California headquarters building exposed numerous historic-era features. These included structural foundations for numerous buildings, including Mathew Keller’s sherry house; several brothels; and cribs, as well as privies, wells, and a portion of a zanja (ditch). Thousands of historic-era artifacts were recovered, including ceramics, bottles and glassware, Chinese ceramics and coins, and numerous other types of household items (Costello et al. 1999).

Beneath this area a prehistoric cemetery was also found, which yielded the remains of 19 individuals (Goldberg et al 1999). The remains of 19 individuals, 14 found in primary

interments and five as cremations, were recovered during emergency excavations. These prehistoric remains date to between 130 years before present (B.P.) and 1000 B.P. Prehistoric artifacts found with these remains were few in number but included projectile points, a steatite bowl, a metate fragment, a stone pipe fragment, a bowl mortar fragment, ceramic vessel fragments, and bone awls and hairpins, as well as hundreds of shell, schist, talc, and jadite beads. These burials were found at depths ranging from approximately 1.7 meters to 2.5 meters below the asphalt of the Union Station parking lot (Goldberg et al 1999).

CA-LAN-1575/H is eligible for the National Register as an archaeological site that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Similarly, this property is eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources for the same reasons. In the past, construction within the boundaries of CA-LAN-1575/H has encountered intact prehistoric and historic components that have yielded important and significant scientific information. As well, a portion of a Native American cemetery on this site is considered sacred to the Gabrieleno Tongva. Portions of the historical component and the Native American cemetery were removed after data-recovery excavations during construction of the MWD headquarters, the MTA facilities, and Union Station, but additional deposits likely exist in other portions of CA-LAN-1575/H.

b. Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

Track realignments conducted as part of the proposed project could potentially result in exposure of cultural resources within archaeological site CA-LAN-1575/H. In an area north of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California headquarters building, a subterranean baggage-handling road is proposed immediately adjacent to an area where human remains were recovered in 1996. Ballast and sterile fill under existing tracks may be of sufficient depth to protect buried cultural remains within the Union Station area, but construction of the aerial structure at the south end of the Union Station yard would pierce this deep ballast and fill layer.

Disturbing intact cultural deposits within CA-LAN-1575/H, whether additional portions of the prehistoric cemetery, other prehistoric materials, or historical deposits, would be considered either a direct or temporary use of the Section 4(f) resource, depending on the duration of the disruption.

c. Avoidance Alternatives

The No-Build Alternative would avoid any potential use of this Section 4(f) resource but would not fulfill the objectives of the proposed project and would not be considered feasible and prudent. The extensive alternatives screening process conducted for the proposed project (see Chapter 2, Project Description, of this EIR/EIS) took avoidance of Section 4(f) properties into account and resulted in the rejection of nearly half of the 48 conceptual alignments that were studied. It is unlikely that any other feasible and prudent alternatives could be generated that would avoid buried cultural resources without a cost of extraordinary magnitude or insurmountable engineering difficulties.

d. Measures to Minimize Harm

In the context of prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, resolution of the potential adverse effect and use of the Section 4(f) resource usually involves site avoidance or mitigation through excavation and additional research. Implementing the mitigation measures stipulated in Section 3-5, Cultural Resources, of this EIR/EIS would result in compliance with requirements regarding assessment and treatment of known cultural resources and assessment and treatment of subsequent cultural resources discoveries during the project.

e. Coordination/Consultation

Consultation with the SHPO, ACHP, and Native American representatives will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes.

6-4.3.2 Archaeological Site AE-UPT-01 (Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Siding)

a. Description and Significance of the Property

Site AE-UPT-01, a set of railroad tracks within the project APE, was recorded as a historical archaeological site during this project study. These tracks occur in two parts. First is a railroad siding exposed in the pavement of Commercial Street in the block between Garey and N. Hewitt Streets, depicted on the 1906 Sanborn fire insurance map. Second, another segment of this railroad siding extends across a now-vacant parcel, a block bounded by Commercial, N. Garey, Ducommun and N. Hewitt streets.

This siding is part of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway (ATSF), which played a prominent role in the development and economic growth of Los Angeles, Southern California, and in a larger context, the United States as a whole. Originally built into Los Angeles in 1888 as the Southern California Railway Company, these routes were acquired by the ATSF in 1905. The ATSF was the one of the first continental railroad routes into California and the first to break the monopoly of the Southern Pacific Railroad. This rail system was instrumental in the development of Los Angeles as a major commercial center and enabled the emigration of large numbers of people. The ATSF system facilitated transportation of goods to the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach; site AE-UPT-01 is a small part of this larger historical pattern.

Site AE-UPT-01 is an industrial lead constructed between 1894 and 1906, approximately ten years after the AT&SF main line was constructed along the west side of the Los Angeles River. AE-UPT-01 does not appear individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion A because it was not built at the same time as the main line and lacks sufficient direct association with the history of the AT&SF and because it lacks integrity of setting, feeling, and association because the original industrial building it served no longer exists. However, historical archaeological site AE-UPT-01 is recommended as eligible for the National Register under Criterion A. This site may also be eligible under Criterion D as an archaeological site that may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history, specifically about the materials

and location of typical industrial lead tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. Similarly, this property is eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources for the same reasons.

b. Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use

The proposed project would include construction within the boundaries of site AE-UPT-01. South of U.S. 101, construction of the trestle structure could disturb areas within city blocks likely to contain cultural materials, including site AE-UPT-01. Disturbing intact cultural elements of this site, including both known and buried railroad-related materials, would be considered either a direct or temporary use of the resource, depending on the duration of the disruption.

c. Avoidance Alternatives

See discussion above for archaeological site CA-LAN-1575/H.

d. Measures to Minimize Harm

See discussion above for archaeological site CA-LAN-1575/H.

e. Coordination/Consultation

Consultation with the SHPO and ACHP will continue as part of the ongoing Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes.

6-5 SECTION 4(f) COORDINATION/CONSULTATION

The following persons and agencies have been consulted as part of the Section 4(f) and Section 106 processes:

U.S. Department of Interior

National Park Service

California State Historic Preservation Officer

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council—Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson

Gabrieleno/Tongva Council—Anthony Morales, Chairperson

Ti'at Society

Samuel H. Dunlap, Gabrieleno

Craig Torres, Gabrieleno/Tongva

Alfred L. Valenzuela, Gabrieleno, Serrano, Vanyume, Chumash, Tataviam, Kitanemuk

Jim Valasques, Gabrieleno

AIA Los Angeles

California Preservation Foundation

California Historical Society

Chinese Historical Society

California State Railroad Museum

El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument/Avilla Adobe

Friends of the Los Angeles River

Getty Conservation Institute

Historical Society of Southern California

Japanese American National Museum

Lincoln Heights Historical Society

Lomita Railroad Museum

Los Angeles Conservancy

Los Angeles City Historical Society

Los Angeles County Historic Landmarks and Records Commission

Los Angeles Police Historical Society

Los Angeles Railroad Heritage Foundation

Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design

City of Los Angeles Planning Department

City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission

City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency

Natural History Museum

Pacific Railroad Historical Society

San Bernardino Railroad Historical Society

Society of Architectural Historians, Southern California Chapter

Southern Pacific Historical & Technical Society

Southwest Museum

Train Riders Association of California

Train Web, Inc.

The Transit Coalition

Travel Town Transportation Museum

Wheel Clicks

Copies of correspondence with the aforementioned persons and agencies ~~will be~~ are attached to the Section 4(f) Evaluation in ~~the~~ this Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement.

6-6 SECTION 6(f)(3) CONSIDERATIONS

Section 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCF Act) (16 USC §4601-4) contains provisions to protect federal investments in park and recreation resources and the quality of those assisted resources. The law recognizes the likelihood that changes in land use or development may make some assisted areas obsolete over time, particularly in rapidly changing urban areas. At the same time, the law discourages casual discards of park and recreation facilities by ensuring that changes or conversions from recreation use will bear a cost—a cost that assures taxpayers that investments in the park and recreation resources will not be squandered. The LWCF Act includes a clear mandate to protect grant-assisted areas from conversions:

SEC. 6(f)(3) - No property acquired or developed with assistance under this section shall, without the approval of the Secretary, be converted to other than public outdoor recreation uses. The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if he finds it to be in accord with the then existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location.

This “anti-conversion” requirement applies to all parks and other sites that have been the subject of LWCF grants of any type, whether for acquisition of parkland, development, or rehabilitation of facilities.

A review of the LWCF grants database indicates that no park and recreation facilities funded with LWCF funds would be affected by the proposed project. Consultation with the National Park Service has been initiated in order to verify the findings of the database search.

CHAPTER 5 - AGENCY COORDINATION

Agency consultation and participation has been on-going throughout the life of the project. Monthly Project Development Team (PDT) meetings were held at Amtrak offices in Los Angeles at Union Station from the beginning of the screening process, and these meetings are scheduled to continue throughout the life of the proposed project.

The PDT meetings were attended by Amtrak; Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF); California Department of Transportation (Department); Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink); Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA); City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation and the project consultant team.

5-1 FEDERAL AGENCIES

The proposed project was presented to responsible federal agencies with jurisdiction over and or interest in the proposed project through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) scoping process. The text of the Scoping report can be found in Chapter 7, Public Outreach. The full scoping report, *Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project, Scoping Report* is available upon request.

The NEPA scoping process was initiated by publishing the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on June 18, 2002. (FR 41749, Vol. 67, No. 118.). The NOI provided a description of the proposed project, public agency scoping meeting information, project management contact information, and the information regarding the closing date for the scoping period (July 29, 2002.).

Six Federal agencies and three Members of Congress received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study Checklist via the scoping process for the CEQA process. Please see section 5-2 for a description of the scoping process.

The Department is conducting consultation and coordinating its efforts with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regarding the U.S. 101 segment of the proposed project.

5-2 STATE AGENCIES

The proposed regionally significant transportation project was presented to nineteen responsible and trustee State agencies; transportation agencies within a 10-mile radius; and other interested parties through the CEQA scoping process. The scoping process was initiated by posting the NOP and Initial Study Checklist with the State of California, Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and the City of Los Angeles County Clerk on June 18, 2003.

The NOP contained the project description, project management contact information, and the public and agency scoping meetings information. The Initial Study checklist contained a project location map, and a preliminary checklist of potential areas of environmental impact.

A meeting was held with the California High Speed Rail Authority on September 18, 2002. The presentation included an overview of planning that had taken place to date and preliminary identification of environmental issues. The purpose of the meeting was to present the proposed project to the Board of the Authority, and to reveal any potential conflicts with the two projects. It appears that there are no conflicts, and each project team has contact information of the other, in case any conflicts should arrive.

Consultation and coordination with the California Air Resources Board and the Public Utilities Commission have been initiated. A letter was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission on October 2, 2002 requesting the contact information for tribal representatives that may have an interest in the proposed project. The Native American Commission responded with the information requested and letters with accompanying project location maps were sent out on November 4, 2002 inviting the Native Americans to participate in the project, as well as to assist the proposed project team with sacred lands identification.

Other State Agencies consulted were:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control - Andre Amy; Julie Johnson, DTSC Cypress.

California State Water Resources Control Board.

Southern California Edison – Planning: Mr. Bud Corn.

5-2.1 Section 106 Consultation

Scoping meetings were held as a part of the CEQA and NEPA process June 25, 2002, for local government agencies and other interested parties. A separate meeting was held with the Los Angeles Conservancy on July 1, 2002.

Compliance with *Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, as amended* is documented in Chapter 3.5 Cultural Resources. The following is a summary of the Section 106 consultation process.

The Section 106 guidelines require that a federal agency evaluate all properties within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and identify historic properties by gathering information from consulting parties, applying the National Register Criteria, and seeking concurrence from the SHPO or Indian tribe, as appropriate. During the preparation of this DEIS, the FRA and the Department have identified the following consulting parties for historic properties:

- California State Historic Preservation Office
- Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council –Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson
- Gabrielino/Tongva Council –Anthony Morales, Chairperson
- Ti’At Society

- Samuel H. Dunlap, Gabrielino Tribe
- Craig Torres, Gabrielino Tongva Tribe
- Alfred L. Valenzuela, Gabrieleno, Serrano, Vanyume, Chumash, Tataviam, Kitanemuk Tribes
- Jim Valasques, Gabrielino Tribe.

The Department, on behalf of FRA and FHWA, held consultation meetings with the California SHPO on July 11, 2002, December 12, 2002, and June 13, 2003. Letters were sent to the listed Native American groups and individuals on November 4, 2002.

Letters were sent to the other interested parties on January 21, 2002, including the following:

- AIA Los Angeles
- California Preservation Foundation
- California Historical Society
- Chinese Historical Society
- California State Railroad Museum
- El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument/Avilla Adobe
- Friends of the Los Angeles River
- Getty Conservation Institute
- Historical Society of Southern California
- Japanese American National Museum
- Lincoln Heights Historical Society
- Lomita Railroad Museum
- Los Angeles Conservancy
- Los Angeles City Historical Society
- Los Angeles County Historic Landmarks and Records Commission
- Los Angeles Police Historical Society
- Los Angeles Railroad Heritage Foundation

- Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
- City of Los Angeles Planning Department
- City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission
- City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
- Natural History Museum
- Pacific Railroad Historical Society
- San Bernardino Railroad Historical Society
- Society of Architectural Historians, Southern California Chapter
- Southern Pacific Historical & Technical Society
- Southwest Museum
- Train Riders Association of California
- Train Web, Inc.
- The Transit Coalition
- Travel Town Transportation Museum
- Wheel Clicks

5-3 REGIONAL/LOCAL AGENCIES

A number of stakeholder briefings have taken place during the life of this project. The purpose of the stakeholder briefings is to ensure that local elected officials, agencies and bureaus remain up to date on the study's progress. Information presented included discussing the existing corridor transportation problems, potential solutions, and anticipated environmental impacts. Information was also presented at policy and technical committee meetings. At each meeting, attendees were presented with opportunities to identify issues, raise concerns, and seek clarifications, which have been incorporated into this document.

- County of Los Angeles, County Supervisor, Office of Gloria Molina
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- City of Los Angeles City Councilman, Office of Nick Pacheco
- City of Los Angeles, City Council, Office of Jan Perry

- City of Los Angeles, General Services Department
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Planning
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation
- City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services
- City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Lighting
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works.
- Amtrak Police Department
- City of Los Angeles - Shahin Nourshad, City HAMAT Supervisor; Virginia Martinez, Public Health Investigations.
- City of Los Angeles Police Department- Al Deraby; Property Officer Kim; Mary Allen (Property Supervisor).
- City of Los Angeles Fire Department, Jim Wells, HAMAT Unit; Kathy Ainsworth, Fire Department Bureau, Valerie Tony, HAMAT Unit.
- Los Angeles County- Diane Benson; Rick Arbar, County Assessor; Jacklyn Neal, Real Estate Division.
- Los Angeles County Department of Health Services- Arturo Aguirre, Administration; Joe Bellomo, Environmental Services; Heidi Sato, Management Information Systems; Arthur Tiltzer.
- Los Angeles County Fire Department HAMAT - Felipe Mendoza; Ricy Parcon; Fernando Flores, County Inspector.
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power - Lupe Gonzales; Don Giddings, LADWP Materials.
- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board - David Bachorawski, Cindy Flores.
- Southern California Gas Company, Jamie Van de Burg, Underground Services; Engineering and Technical Services - Dan Meltzer, Chemical Environmental; Sam Iacono, Materials and Equipment.
- Southern California Edison - Planning, Bud Corn.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Southern California Regional Rail Authority

- City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering. Street Program, November 2002.
- Los Angeles Fire Department, Ben Flores, Inspector, February 2003.
- Boyle Heights Youth Opportunity Center. Ed Hernandez, Facilities Director,. October 2002.
- Los Angeles Sheriffs Department Custody Operations Division, Deputy Ethan Marquez, Deputy, February 2003.
- El Pueblo De Los Angeles Historical Monument, Cheryl Soriano, Management Analyst, October 2002.
- City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, Lee Sweet, Business Facilities Director, October 2002.
- Los Angeles Fire Department, Hydrants and Access, Mike Thule, February 2003.
- Los Angeles Police Department, Sergeant Wong, Watch Commander, February 2003.
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Transportation Engineer-Interagency Projects, Letter of August 2, 2002, regarding scope of analysis.
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Mike Bagheri, Transportation Engineer, Phone conversation regarding related projects analysis. February 25, 2003.

5-4 CONSULTATION DURING PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

The Draft EIS/EIR was released to the public on September 3, 2004 and was available for review public comment through October 25, 2004. (Please see Chapter 7: Public Outreach for more information.) At that time, all responsible and trustee agencies were invited to review and comment on the environmental document in light of their agency's jurisdiction and mission. Comments were received from the following public agencies: Los Angeles County Sheriff, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, Southern Coast Air Quality Management District, United States, Environmental Protection Agency, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, California Governor's Office of Planning & Research, State Clearinghouse, State of California, Department of Transportation, Highway Patrol, County of Los Angeles Fire Department and the Southern California Association of Governments. Please see Chapter 12: Comments and Responses for a full accounting of the comments received, and the response to those comments.

CHAPTER 4 - OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

For the sections in this chapter that are required by both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), both NEPA and CEQA language is employed in the discussion of impacts.

In the sections in this chapter that are required only by NEPA, and not by CEQA, solely the NEPA term “adverse” (and not the CEQA term “significant”) is used to describe impacts.

In the sections in this chapter that are required only by CEQA, and not by NEPA, solely the CEQA term “significant” (and not the NEPA term “adverse”) is used to describe impacts.

4-1 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

This section is required by NEPA only.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would maintain and enhance the productivity and general quality of life in Southern California through attainment of the following objectives:

- Improve operational efficiencies and scheduling reliability for trains using Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) by reducing the constraint on train movements that results from stub-end operation.
- Improve pedestrian access and functionality of the passenger platforms, while also improving connectivity with other transit services.
- Increase the capacity of LAUS to accommodate planned growth of Amtrak and SCRRRA train services.

The benefits of improving the reliability and efficiency of the local and regional transportation system would be realized in the near term and would likely increase over the long term as the need for transportation infrastructure increases.

In addition to the near- and long-term productivity benefits and improved quality of life derived from the proposed project, certain short-term uses of the environment would occur during construction of the proposed project. These short-term uses of the environment would include temporary, localized traffic obstructions, air emissions, noise, vibration, and light and glare that typically occur in the vicinity of construction activities. Beneficial short-term effects of the proposed project would be related to new construction employment and purchases of construction materials, supplies and services.

4-2 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

This section is required by both NEPA and CEQA.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would involve certain commitments of resources. In some instances, the resource committed would be recovered after a short period of time. Often, however, resources would be irreversibly or irretrievably committed to the proposed project because they would be permanently consumed or they would be dedicated to a particular use for an essentially limitless period of time.

The proposed project would involve the commitment of a range of natural, physical, human, and fiscal resources. For example, the land used for the project would continue the existing commitment of land in the area for transportation purposes. To the extent that this commitment would be for long-range use, it would be an irreversible commitment. In the event, however, that a greater need would arise for the land in the future, or the corridor were no longer needed, the land could conceivably be converted to some other use. Currently, there is no reason to expect that such a need for conversion would ever be necessary or desirable.

The proposed project would also require that various other resources be irreversibly or irretrievably committed. Non-renewable fossil fuel resources would be necessary to power construction equipment, electrical devices, vehicles, and buses. Considerable amounts of other types of resources would also be expended, including iron, steel, wood, sand, stone, aggregate, and cement construction materials. Additionally, large amounts of labor and natural resources would have to be committed to the fabrication and preparation of these construction materials. This commitment of resources would be considered irretrievable, except for the possible recycling of raw materials in the unlikely event that the corridor were ever dismantled. These resources are generally not in short supply and their use would not have an adverse effect on their continued availability. Given the commitment of these resources well into the foreseeable future, however, their use should be considered irreversible and irretrievable.

A substantial one-time expenditure of local, state, and federal financial resources would also be necessary to construct the proposed project. This expense would be offset by the direct and indirect benefits to the local and regional economy from new construction employment, purchases of construction materials and services, and long-term economic development opportunities resulting from an enhanced transportation system.

The commitment of resources to construct and operate the proposed project is based on the belief that residents, employees and visitors would benefit from the improved efficiency, accessibility, safety, and environmental quality of the transportation system in Southern California. These benefits are anticipated to substantially outweigh any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources.

4-3 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

This section is required by CEQA only.

As documented in the responses to the checklist below, the proposed project is not expected to cause any substantial growth within the vicinity of the project area or in the region.

- *Will the project attract more residential development or new population into the community or planning area?* No. The proposed project would improve the existing LAUS rail transportation infrastructure in order to meet projected growth in Amtrak and Metrolink passenger service. These projections are assumed to be in accordance with the State Rail Plan, Amtrak's Improvement Program for California, and the SCAG projections of population, households, and employment. Thus, the project would not be expected to directly or indirectly attract more residential development or population beyond that which is already contemplated in the applicable planning forecasts.
- *Will the project encourage the development of more acreage of employment generating land uses in the area (such as commercial, industrial, or office)?* No. The proposed project would only result in the construction of rail infrastructure facilities associated with LAUS. No substantial amount of surplus property is expected to exist once project construction is completed. Most other vacant land for commercial and industrial use in the immediate vicinity of LAUS is currently subject to the development regulations in the City of Los Angeles' Alameda District Plan and would presumably be developed in accordance with that plan.
- *Will the project lead to the increase of roadway, sewer, water supply, or drainage capacity?* No. The project would involve no substantial modifications to any of the aforementioned facilities.
- *Will the project encourage the rezoning or reclassification of lands from agriculture, open space, or low density residential to a more intensive land use?* No. See response above related to surplus property and commercial development potential.
- *Is the project not in conformance with the growth-related policies, goals, or objectives of the local general plan or the area growth management plan? Or, is it in conflict with implementation measures contained in the area's growth management plan?* No. As discussed in Section 3-10, the project would be consistent with the applicable local and regional plans.
- *Will the project lead to the intensification of development densities or accelerate the schedule for development?* No. See response above related to surplus property and commercial development potential.
- *Will the project measurably and significantly decrease home to work commuter travel times to and from the project area (i.e., more than 10 percent overall reduction or five minutes or more in commute time savings)?* Perhaps. The project may result in some minor incremental reduction in commuter travel times given the increased efficiency of rail service in a run-through track configuration as compared to the present stub-end tracks. This reduction would,

however, not likely be so large as to induce increased development in either the downtown Los Angeles area or outlying regions. Downtown development and outlying development would instead be more likely to continue to be most influenced by their relative accessibility via private automobiles, as well as the availability of other supportive infrastructure and public services rather than commuter rail service alone. In addition, the improvements at LAUS would tend only to increase the efficiency of train movements through the station itself, rather than from origin points to destination points.

- *Is the project directly related to the generation of cumulative effects?* No. See discussion of cumulative effects below.

4-4 INDIRECT/SECONDARY IMPACTS

This section is required by both NEPA and CEQA.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would involve both direct effects and indirect (secondary) effects. Indirect effects may include those impacts that are induced by a proposed project, but which tend to occur at some distance from and/or time after the project (e.g., the effects of transportation development on long-term population growth). Indirect effects may also include those impacts that occur as a result of interrelationships between different resource systems in the environment (e.g., the effects of water pollution on sensitive biological resources).

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations governing the implementation of NEPA (40 CFR 1508.8) define indirect effects as those that are:

“...caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.”

Indirect effects cannot always be clearly and immediately discerned, or precisely measured under standard environmental impact assessment methodologies. Additionally, very little formal guidance on analyzing indirect effects has been developed by governmental agencies. The analysis that follows considers the potential indirect effects, if any, that would result from construction and operation of the proposed project.

4-4.1. Acquisitions and Displacements

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to acquisitions and displacements.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to acquisitions and displacements would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-1.

4-4.2. Air Quality

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to air quality.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to air quality would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-2.

4-4.3. Biological Resources

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to biological resources.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to biological resources would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-3.

4-4.4. Community Facilities and Services

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to community facilities and services.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to community services and facilities would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-4.

4-4.5. Cultural Resources

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to cultural resources.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to cultural resources would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-5.

4-4.6. Energy

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to energy.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to energy would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-6.

4-4.7. Geology/Seismic Hazards

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to geology and seismic hazards.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to geology and seismic hazards would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-8.

4-4.8. Hazardous Materials

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to hazardous materials.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to hazardous materials would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-9.

4-4.9. Land Use and Planning

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to land use and planning.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to land use and planning would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-10.

4-4.10. Noise and Vibration

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to noise and vibration.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to noise and vibration would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-11.

4-4.11. Railroad Operations

The proposed project would not have any negative indirect effects related to railroad operations.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to railroad operations would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-12.

4-4.12. Safety and Security

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to safety and security.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to safety and security would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-13.

4-4.13. Population, Housing, and Employment

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to population, housing, and employment.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to population, housing, and employment would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-14.

4-4.14. Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to traffic and transportation.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to traffic and transportation would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-15.

4-4.15. Utilities

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to utilities.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to utilities would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-16.

4-4.16. Visual Quality/Aesthetics

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to visual quality/aesthetics.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to visual quality/aesthetics would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-17.

4-4.17. Water Quality and Hydrology

The proposed project would not have any indirect effects related to water quality/hydrology.

The potential effects of the proposed project related to water quality/hydrology would be considered direct effects, since they would be limited to the immediate vicinity and time frame, and they would not affect other resource systems. These effects are described in Section 3-18.

4-5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section is required by both NEPA and CEQA.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would involve the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project as well as the cumulative effects of the proposed project combined with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

For purposes of analyzing the potential cumulative effects of the proposed project, the definitions of “cumulative impact” under both NEPA and CEQA have been followed. The CEQ regulations governing the implementation of NEPA (40 CFR 1508.7) define a cumulative impact as:

“the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.”

The State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code of Regs. sec. 15355) define cumulative impacts as:

“. . . two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

(a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.

(b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.”

The analysis of the cumulative effects of the proposed project also incorporates the suggestions in the CEQ’s handbook entitled “Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act” (January 1997), which is intended as an informational document rather than formal agency guidance.

Based on the CEQ and State CEQA Guidelines discussion of cumulative effects, the following principles can be applied to the assessment of cumulative effects of the proposed project:

- Cumulative effects typically are caused by the aggregate effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. These are the effects (past, present, and future) of the proposed action on a given resource and the effects (past, present, and future), if any, caused by all other related actions that affect the same resource.
- When other related actions are likely to affect a resource that is also affected by the proposed action, it does not matter who (public or private entity) has taken the related action(s).

- The scope of cumulative effects analyses can usually be limited to reasonable geographic boundaries and time periods. These boundaries should extend only so far as the point at which a resource is no longer substantially affected or where the effects are so speculative as to no longer be truly meaningful.
- Cumulative effects can include the effects (past, present, and future) on a given resource caused by similar types of actions (e.g., air emissions from several individual highway projects) and/or the effects (past, present, and future) on a given resource caused by different types of actions (e.g., air emissions from a highway project, a solid waste incinerator, and a mining facility).

The analysis that follows considers the potential cumulative effects, if any, that would result from construction and operation of the proposed project, combined with construction and operation of other related projects.

4-5.1. Related Projects

As described more fully in Appendix K, several related projects have been identified in the vicinity of the proposed project. These include such major projects as the recently-opened MTA Gold Line light-rail transit (LRT) extension, the Eastside LRT extension and overcrossing of U.S. 101, widening and reconfiguration of U.S. 101, and potential Maglev or High Speed Rail systems. In addition, numerous other building and infrastructure projects are in various stages of planning and development in the project area.

4-5.2. Impacts

4.5.2.1 Acquisitions and Displacements

Other than the Caltrans U.S. 101 widening project and MTA Eastside LRT Project, the only other major project proposed in the immediate vicinity of the study area is the new police headquarters site. This project would be located on the parcel bounded by Alameda Street, Temple Street, Vignes Street, and 1st Street, which is often referred to as the Mangrove Estates site. All three of these projects would be constructed on currently vacant properties, and thus would not involve the displacement of any businesses other than parking. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be a cumulative adverse effect under NEPA (significant impact under CEQA) from displacements that could result from the proposed developments in the area. Any additional redevelopment of vacant parcels that may result from other projects in the area would also be subject to the City of Los Angeles planning process, thereby minimizing or avoiding any potential adverse effects related to property acquisitions and displacements.

4.5.2.2 Air Quality

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the related projects in the area could result in more downtown congestion, which could adversely affect traffic, noise levels, and air quality in the project vicinity. However, the proposed project would not substantially contribute

to traffic, noise, or air quality impacts, and would actually result in decreases in vehicular travel to and from the project area. Therefore the project would not substantially contribute to an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on air quality.

4.5.2.3 Biological Resources

There is little potential for cumulative biological impacts given the lack of habitat in the study area. Projects that may affect nesting birds, or the riparian or fish habitat of the Los Angeles River, have some potential for cumulative impacts. However, since it can be reasonably assumed that all projects would be constructed in accordance with federal and state regulations, it is unlikely that cumulative biological impacts would occur.

Development of the proposed project in conjunction with the related transportation projects would not result in or add to loss of open space, vegetation communities, native plants and wildlife, sensitive species, wetland or riparian areas, or affect habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan areas. The proposed project and related projects involve fully developed, urban areas with minimal to no native habitat, open spaces, and sensitive biological resources. Future development of the Crown Industrial site could contribute to cumulative impacts to biological resources if construction were to occur during the breeding season and killdeer nests were present on the site. Mitigation measures to preclude such impacts have been adopted for that project. Overall, cumulative impacts would be less than adverse under NEPA (less than significant under CEQA).

4.5.2.4 Community Facilities and Services

a. Police

Amtrak operates its own security service and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD) patrols Metrolink facilities. The Los Angeles Police Department provides services when needed and requested by Amtrak Police or County Sheriff's. Amtrak police, supported by LAPD and LACSD, would provide police protection services for the run-through tracks. Related projects in the vicinity of LAUS include construction or rehabilitation of over 4,400 residential units and over 7 million square feet of commercial, office, public, medical, and retail space. This new construction would likely increase the residential and employee populations in the project study area, which would place additional demand on the LAPD Central Community Police station. However, the proposed LAPD Police Headquarters, which would be located within 0.2 mile of the run-through tracks, would likely help accommodate future demand in the area. Because Amtrak maintains its own security, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to cumulative impacts to police services or cumulative increases in demand for police services. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on police services.

b. Fire

As discussed earlier, the proposed project is not expected to increase demand for fire protection services because such demand is primarily attributable to increased commercial and residential

development rather than commuter transit projects. Increases in the residential and employee populations in the area are expected as a result of the development component of the related projects, and as a consequence, demand for fire protection services in the area would increase. However, because the proposed project would not by itself increase fire protection demands, it would not contribute to cumulative impacts to fire protection services or cumulative increases in demand for fire protection services. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to potentially adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts.

c. Schools

Related projects in the project vicinity would include an increase of approximately 4,400 residential units, and multiple commercial/industrial/office developments. The new residential development would directly increase enrollment in local schools. Student enrollment could also be indirectly affected by increases in employment due to new non-residential development. The amount of residential and commercial/industrial development proposed in the area could be substantial, and it is possible that schools that are currently overcrowded could be adversely affected by increased enrollment and new or expanded facilities would be required. One public high school and one charter school have been proposed in the project vicinity, which would help accommodate some of the demand. Because the proposed project is a rail transportation project that would not increase the amount of residential units in the project area, it would not increase local school enrollment and therefore would not contribute to adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts to schools.

d. Parks

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the proposed project and related projects could place additional demands on park services in the area. Construction of the proposed Cornfield State Park, a 32-acre park, and renovations at El Pueblo De Los Angeles would help to accommodate the need for parks in the downtown area. If additional park facilities were required to maintain existing service levels, significant cumulative impacts could occur. However, because the proposed project would not affect demand for parks, the run-through tracks would not result in or substantially contribute to an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on parks.

e. Places of Worship

The proposed project would provide an alternative transportation mode into the downtown LA area, and is expected to reduce future vehicular trips to and from the project area. This would have beneficial effect of reducing traffic-related inconveniences (such as congestion, noise and air quality) to places of worship. Related projects such as development projects would increase residential and employee populations in the project area, which in turn could increase demand for places of worship; however, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to the cumulative demand for places of worship because it is likely that users of the Run-Through Tracks Project would utilize such places in the vicinity of their homes. Consequently, the project would not substantially contribute to an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on places of worship.

f. Transportation Facilities

Related projects such as development projects have the potential to increase vehicular traffic in the project area. The impacts of, and potential mitigation pertaining to, related projects would be addressed in the environmental document for each project. The proposed project would provide an alternative mode of transportation to and from the downtown area, with a corresponding decrease in vehicular travel. Consequently, the proposed project is expected to reduce congestion and demand for vehicle-related transportation facilities and thus is not expected to contribute to significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project would help to accommodate planned increases in transit services.

g. Government Facilities

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the proposed project and related projects would not place additional demands on government facilities in the project vicinity because the demand for service at the federal and county jails, the civic center, William Mead Homes, and municipal office buildings is not derived for the population immediately surrounding the facilities. Each of the facilities is designed to accommodate the needs of the City or County as a whole. Therefore, the proposed project and related projects are not expected to result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts on government facilities.

h. Libraries and Museums

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the proposed project and related projects could place additional demands on library services in the project vicinity. The China Town Branch Library and the Little Tokyo Branch library have recently been rebuilt to accommodate the additional needs of downtown residents. In addition, the Central Los Angeles Public Library, which has a collection with over two million items, is located 1.25 miles from the run through tracks, in the center of downtown. Because the proposed project would not affect demand for libraries the proposed project would not result in or substantially contribute to an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on libraries.

i. Hospitals

Increases in residential and employee populations due to the related projects could place additional demands on hospital services in the area. Los Angeles County USC Medical Center and White Memorial Medical Center, two hospitals in the project vicinity, are currently undergoing reconstruction. The White Memorial Medical Center renovation will include an additional 105,000-square feet. The County USC Medical Center reconstruction will include a total of 1.5 million square feet. Both facilities will be better equipped to handle the medical needs of downtown residents. Because the proposed project would not affect demand for hospitals the proposed project would not result in or substantially contribute to an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impact on hospitals.

4.5.2.5 Cultural Resources

a. Cumulative Impacts to Historic Resources

Union Station is the only non-archaeological resource that would be affected by the proposed project. Therefore for the purposes of this EIS/EIR the discussion of cumulative impacts is limited to the Union Station National Register listed property.

Projects with cumulative or potentially cumulative effects to Union Station with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project are separated into two categories, Contextual Impacts and Operational Impacts.

Projects with Contextual Impacts to Union Station

Contextual Impacts are those affecting the overall historic character of Union station and either directly or indirectly affecting the character defining features that qualify the property for listing in the National Register. Past projects which caused adverse contextual impacts include Gateway Plaza and MTA Tower, MWD Headquarters, and El Monte Busway.

□ Alameda Specific Plan

The 12-story MWD Building was the first building constructed of six low to high rise buildings proposed as part of the Alameda Specific Plan. The Alameda Specific Plan if further implemented would include the phased construction of 2 low-rise and 3 mid- to high-rise (5 to 25 stories) buildings on the Union Station property, comprising over 6 million square feet of new office and retail space. In addition the plan calls for partially decking over the platform and track area to accommodate new construction directly above. These new buildings would cause direct impacts due to partial demolition and alteration of portions of the terminal buildings, visual impacts due to shadow and shade on and blocked or partially obscured views of the Union Station terminal buildings, patios and landscaping.

□ Alameda Street widening and HOV lanes and bridges over U.S. 101

This project if implemented would result in a reduction in the size of the National Register property along the Alameda Street frontage.

□ High Speed Rail Project

The High Speed Rail project has the potential to introduce adverse visual impacts at the Union Station property because its railroad tracks, passenger platforms, passenger stairs and/or elevators would be on a structure elevated above the existing Union Station platforms and canopies. Because of its height above the existing platforms and proposed Run Through Project platforms, the structure may be highly visible in views facing east toward Union Station, and this may have adverse visual impacts on the National Register-listed property.

❑ Maglev Project

The Maglev Rail Project would introduce an elevated structure similar to the proposed High Speed Rail Project above the existing Union Station platforms and canopies. Adverse visual impacts on the National Register-listed property would be similar to those that would be caused by High Speed Rail.

❑ LAUS Run Through-Tracks Project

The LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would not cause contextual impacts, because it would continue railroad operations and would have no demonstrable visual effect on the main Union Station terminal buildings, patios and landscaping.

❑ Summary of Contextual Impacts

The above-mentioned projects combined with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would have adverse contextual cumulative impacts to Union Station. However the LAUS Run Through-Tracks Project would represent a minimal contribution to those impacts.

Projects with Operational Impacts to Union Station

Operational Impacts are those impacts that affect the historic day-to-day operations of Union Station as a passenger rail station, including train switching, rail passenger service and pedestrian access to and from passenger platforms. Past projects that caused adverse operational impacts include the Red Line and Gold Lines, which are discussed in detail in section 5-5.2.5(b) above.

Of the related projects identified for this EIS/EIR the following have the potential to create operational cumulative impacts to Union Station.

❑ MTA East Side Extension Project

The MTA East Side LRT project will add an elevated platform and a bridge over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101, which would cause visual impacts at the platform and track area, but would continue railroad operations. Therefore there would be a minimal operational cumulative impact.

❑ High Speed Rail Project

The introduction of high speed rail service at Union Station would add an elevated platform above the existing platforms and canopies and a guideway over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. It would also introduce new means for passengers to circulate, including stairs and elevators above the existing platform level. This would result in visual impacts at the platform and track area, but would continue railroad operations, albeit with a new technology. Therefore there would be a minimal operational cumulative impact.

❑ **Maglev Rail Project**

The Maglev Project would introduce an elevated structure similar to the proposed High Speed Rail Project above the existing Union Station platforms and canopies, and for the same reasons, would have a minimal operational cumulative impact, despite the new railroad technology.

❑ **LAUS Run Through-Tracks Project**

The LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would add two elevated platforms and a new bridge over the El Monte Busway and US 101, which would cause visual impacts at the platform and track area, but would continue railroad operations. MTA's Pasadena Gold Line project has already introduced visual and aesthetic/architectural changes to the platform and track area at Union Station. In addition the platforms, ramps and canopies have undergone many changes and alterations due to projects that occurred in the 1980's and 1990's. Therefore there would be a minimal cumulative impact.

❑ **Summary of Operational Impacts**

The above-mentioned projects combined with the LAUS Run Through Tracks Project would represent an overall beneficial impact to Union Station because they are restoring / expanding / enhancing passenger rail service at Union Station. These projects combined with the LAUS Run-Through Tracks Project would have adverse cumulative impacts to Union Station. However the LAUS Run Through-Tracks Project would represent a minimal contribution to those impacts.

b. Cumulative Impacts to Archaeological Resources

Related projects in the project area and other development in the City could result in the progressive loss of as-yet-unrecorded archaeological resources. This loss, without proper mitigation, would be a significant cumulative impact. As discussed above, the archaeological survey conducted for the proposed project identified several archaeological resource sites located in the APE. Thus, the proposed project and related development in the area and region could contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on archaeological resources. However, the proposed project includes mitigation that would reduce potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than adverse and significant level. Related projects that are likely to affect archaeological resources (i.e. High Speed Rail, Maglev, and other related projects in the immediate vicinity) are likely to implement similar mitigation in addition to data recovery excavations, monitoring, soils testing, photography, mapping, or drawing to adequately recover the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological resource. Consequently, after mitigation, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to an adverse or significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources.

c. Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resources

The project area is situated upon sediments mapped as Recent alluvium, which has a low potential to contain unique paleontologic resources. However, these recent sediments overlie older Pleistocene alluvial sediments and marine that have a high potential to contain significant

nonrenewable paleontologic resources and is therefore assigned high paleontologic sensitivity. Accordingly, the geographic scope of the area for potential cumulative paleontological impacts would consist of other areas in the region that are geologically similar to the project site and contain similar fossil resources.

Although many of the related projects and ongoing urban development would be located in areas that have been previously disturbed due to past development, construction activities associated with some related projects could, nonetheless, contribute to the progressive loss of paleontological resources and result in potentially significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project could disturb or destroy paleontological resources that may exist on the site, a potentially significant impact. This potential impact would remain after mitigation. Thus, the combined effects of the proposed and related projects could result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to paleontological resources.

4.5.2.6 Energy

Implementation of the related projects in conjunction with the proposed project would also result in additional consumption of energy including electricity, natural gas and petroleum fuels. Additional demand during construction would be short-term. Operation of the related transportation projects would not result in a substantial demand for additional energy or require new energy production or delivery facilities.

4.5.2.7 Geology/Seismic Hazards

There should be no cumulative significant/adverse geologic or seismic impacts. It is assumed that proper design of any project in the area in accordance with engineering standards would mitigate the impacts of strong ground shaking, liquefaction potential, and earthquake induced subsidence.

4.5.2.8 Hazardous Materials

Potential hazardous materials sites have been identified within 1000 feet (305 meters) of proposed improvements. Construction of either alternative would not affect locations other than those specifically identified in this section. Potential impacts associated with the proposed project would not combine with other potentially hazardous conditions to result in a cumulative impact, since each individual project would be implemented to include provisions for remediation to less than significant levels of any encountered contaminants.

4.5.2.9 Land Use and Planning

Taking into consideration the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development projects in the study area, it would be unlikely that the proposed project and those other projects would result in adverse cumulative impacts. First, any other related projects would be held to the same regional and local land use plans and policies as the proposed project, thereby ensuring consistency with those land use regulations. Second, no other related projects have been identified that would conflict with either the proposed project or the existing and planned land

use and development pattern in the study area. Finally, the other related projects in the study, in conjunction with the proposed project, are unlikely to cumulatively induce additional land development beyond that which is already planned. The study area includes a limited amount of developable land, and many other considerations, such as land use regulations and market conditions, would have to be present for development to occur. As a result, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts are anticipated.

4.5.2.10 Noise and Vibration

There is a potential for cumulative impacts to the residential lofts that lie on both sides of the 1st Street Bridge from the transportation projects occurring in the area. The proposed project would not create noise impacts to those properties. However, the Eastside LRT Project and the City of Los Angeles 1st Street Bridge widening project would create new or closer noise sources. It is assumed, however, that noise and vibration mitigation measures included in those projects would be sufficient to ensure that no adverse cumulative effect would result.

4.5.2.11 Railroad Operations

The Build Alternatives under consideration were selected through initial, secondary, and supplemental screening processes, based on engineering and operations criteria relative to track design, freight and passenger rail operations during construction and operations, and environmental criteria. The two alternatives include the concepts that were evaluated to have minimal potential for conflicts with other transportation projects (including the Eastside LRT, Pasadena Gold Line, U.S. 101 Widening, 1st Street Bridge Widening, Commercial Street Widening, Union Station traffic circulation improvements, and statewide high speed rail and Maglev conceptual terminal locations at Union Station). Construction of the Eastside LRT extension began in Summer 2004. U.S. 101 Widening is expected to be completed by 2008 when construction of the Run-Through tracks would commence. Currently, HSR and Maglev alignments and stations are conceptual. Based on the evaluation of potential conflicts with related projects, the current design and phasing of the run-through track alternatives does not preclude the 1st Street Bridge Widening, LAUS traffic circulation improvements, HSR or Maglev project from occurring in the future. Alternate rail operating plans would be developed to ensure that the station facilities and commuter passenger rail services would not be impaired below their current levels of service during development of the HSR or Maglev projects. Cumulative impacts to rail operations and service levels from implementation of the proposed project and related projects are not expected to occur.

4.5.2.12 Safety and Security

a. Construction Period Impacts

There are many related projects in the area, which are varied in their project goals. All of these projects, if cleared for construction, would have to comply with safety and security measures that are related to that particular project. Federal and state guidelines apply to all construction sites and compliance with those requirements make those sites safe for workers and the general

public. Generally, construction sites are isolated zones that are separated from the general public and do not present a safety risk. In the case of this project and three other proposed projects—the Eastside LRT Project, the U.S. 101 Decking (City of Los Angeles), and the widening of U.S. 101 (Caltrans)—would require U.S. 101 to stay open during construction, hence placing vehicles in the construction zone. Although it is not expected that all of these projects would be under construction at the same time, it is possible that the Run-Through Tracks Project construction schedule would overlap with at least one of the above related projects. Should that be the case, there could be a cumulative effect on the safety of vehicles traveling on U.S. 101. As previously stated, this project would implement both Contract Documents and a Site-Specific Safety Plan, both of which would be approved by Caltrans to ensure that all safety regulations are in place to protect workers and vehicles driving on their facility. It is anticipated that other related projects would have similar construction documents for safety and that cumulatively, there would be no increase in safety risk during multiple project construction. Hence, there would be no adverse impacts (under NEPA) to safety and security due to cumulative project construction.

b. Long-Term Impacts

Once operational, these projects would provide grade-separated access over U.S. 101. Several existing bridges span U.S.101 within a short segment of the freeway as vehicle traffic flows north or southbound near downtown Los Angeles. These existing elevated structures present no safety risk to the vehicles traveling underneath them (or over them) and it is anticipated that the Run-Through Tracks Project and any of the related projects would also present no additional safety risk. Therefore, there are no cumulative impacts (under NEPA) related to the Run-Through Tracks Project and other related projects proposed to span U.S. 101.

4.5.2.13 Population, Housing, and Employment

Taking into consideration the incremental effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development projects and transportation improvements in the project area, it would be very unlikely that the proposed project would result in any cumulatively considerable effects on population, housing, and employment since it is assumed that these projects have been accounted for in the applicable planning documents and growth forecasts. Thus, there would be no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts with regard to these issues.

4.5.2.14 Traffic and Transportation

Cumulative traffic impacts could occur if construction of the various transportation projects in the study area (especially in Segments 2 and 3) were to overlap. The first project to begin construction will be the MTA Eastside LRT project, which will begin in late 2003. There is some potential for construction of elements of the project in the vicinity of U.S. 101. However, it is the Caltrans project that will include creation of the median in U.S. 101 that will accommodate the bridge support for the LRT bridge over the freeway. The potential cumulative impact arises from the length of time during which construction activities of the two projects could affect traffic along Alameda Street or streets leading to and from U.S. 101 ramps.

Similarly, 1st Street could have cumulative traffic impacts stemming from the duration of construction of the 1st Street Bridge widening (beginning in 2004), followed by construction of the LRT line and station, and possibly construction of the new police headquarters at 1st and Alameda Streets.

Construction of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would not be likely to begin until after the elements of the Eastside LRT project along Ducommun Street have been completed, thereby reducing the likelihood of cumulative impacts where these two projects overlap geographically.

The potential for cumulative construction-period impacts in the study area would be reduced by implementation of each of the projects under the auspices of a Traffic Management Program (TMP). Each project would have a TMP to organize how detours, lane closures, construction routes, etc., would occur during that project's construction phase. LADOT would participate in developing and approving each plan, and be responsible for overall consideration of the individual plans.

4.5.2.15 Utilities

Implementation of the proposed project in association with the related projects would result in cumulative impacts to existing utilities. Like the proposed project, construction of the related projects (including the proposed Commercial Street Widening and Eastside LRT project) would require utility relocations and protection. Service extensions to serve the projects would also be installed. Temporary, short-term service disruptions would occur during construction. No cumulative long-term service interruptions or additional relocations and service extensions would occur during operation of the related projects.

4.5.2.16 Visual Quality/Aesthetics

When past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the study area are taken into account it is unlikely that the proposed project would result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts.

Only the Union Station Passenger Terminal (Landscape Unit A) possesses a high level of visual quality. Visual quality in the other portions of the area is rather low, and there are no scenic vistas and significant views in this area of the city. Important views, such as of the downtown skyline when viewed from Boyle Heights, would not be affected by the project, due to the project's alignment, siting, and intervening development.

Future projects at Union Station or its vicinity may result in multiple bridges being constructed over U.S. 101. These include the MTA Eastside LRT project, California High Speed Rail project, and Maglev project. The combined projects could therefore result in multiple shadows over a relatively small area. Just to the west, however, U.S. 101 transitions from an elevated to below-grade configuration and is traversed by a number of successive, wide, concrete street overcrossings. This addition of bridge structures and resulting shadow effects is not deemed to be cumulatively significant with respect to existing and foreseeable highway design

characteristics in the vicinity, or with respect to the principal viewer group—motorists—whose attention is expected to be on driving in this high-traffic setting.

The demolition of the buildings at 801 Commercial Street was noted previously. As one of the few early twentieth century factory structures remaining in the neighborhood (Landscape Unit C), and as a familiar neighborhood feature of long-standing, there was concern that it might be an important visual resource meriting retention (in a setting where substantial redevelopment activity has occurred during the last decade or more). A detailed construction chronology of the building complex was prepared (see Section 3-5). This research indicated that this facility underwent numerous alterations over time. Due to its loss of historic fabric it is not deemed eligible for either the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. The buildings therefore are not considered a significant visual resource, and thus the demolition is not considered an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect. For this reason demolition of the building is not considered to be cumulatively significant to the visual setting.

The contribution of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project in significantly diminishing the visual quality of the Union Station setting design is not considered individually or cumulatively significant. Future projects, primarily the Alameda Specific Plan, which calls for substantial new development on the Union Station property—including possible decking over of a portion of the platform area—have far greater the potential to significantly and adversely affect the visual setting of the Union Station.

4.5.2.17 Water Quality and Hydrology

a. Storm Drainage

The area within the drainage areas for the proposed project are developed primarily as commercial and industrial uses. With the exception of a few unimproved, dirt parcels, the area is paved and impervious. The potential of future development in the project area to increase impervious surfaces and increase runoff is negligible. As detailed in Section 2-4, several local and regional transportation projects are in various planning stages in the vicinity of the proposed project. As with the proposed project, surface runoff from these developments would likely be accommodated by the existing storm drainage system. Final engineering for each project would have to address any potential of increased flows and peak concentrations.

b. Water Quality

Potential water quality effects of related projects would be similar to the proposed project. Development of related projects could combine with impacts from the proposed project to result in adverse or significant cumulative impacts to both surface water and ground water quality. Construction activities could likely result in erosion and sedimentation effects. As with the proposed project, the identified, related transportation projects in the vicinity would be characterized by long-term construction periods involving heavy equipment and substantial quantities of varied construction materials. Construction management and diligent ‘housekeeping’ would be required to minimize water quality impacts.

An increased intensity of road and railway projects in the vicinity would increase the potential for related water quality impacts on a long-term basis. Increase train and motor vehicle traffic could result in an increase in hydrocarbon pollutants and litter.

c. Flood Hazard

The project area west of Los Angeles River is not within the 100-year floodplain. Related projects in the area, therefore, are not anticipated to be subject to flood hazards or combine with the proposed project to result in a cumulative, flood hazard impact.

4-6 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

This section is required by both NEPA and CEQA.

The build alternatives for the proposed project would result in no unavoidable adverse impacts under NEPA, and two unavoidable significant impacts under CEQA, after mitigation measures are applied. These impacts are described in section 3-2 of Chapter 3, and can be summarized as follows:

- Both build alternatives would result in unavoidable significant impacts under CEQA for construction-period air quality emissions. Mitigation measures would not reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- Both build alternatives would result in unavoidable significant impacts under CEQA for long-term/operational air quality emissions. Mitigation measures would not reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

4-7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

This section is required by both NEPA and CEQA.

The No Build Alternative would not involve any substantial construction that would not also be common to all of the other alternatives; therefore, it would avoid the adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) associated with such construction. The No Build Alternative would not, however, offer the benefits of improved train movement and associated improvements in commuter rail transit service at LAUS that would be afforded by the build alternatives (i.e., Alternative A and Alternative A-1).

Subsequent to the circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. This new construction renders Alternative A a much less feasible alternative, since it would require acquisition and displacement of a new business. Due to this change, Alternative A-1 is the locally preferred alternative has more significant impacts than Alternative A-1.

For the reasons cited below, Alternative A-1 is judged to be environmentally superior to either the No Build Alternative or Alternative A:

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, Alternative A-1 would have no adverse effects under NEPA (no significant impacts under CEQA) related to acquisitions and displacements. Alternative A would require one more full acquisition and one more aerial easement than would Alternative A-1. Additionally, as noted above, a large parcel within the Alternative A alignment that was vacant at the time the draft document was prepared was acquired and is the site of a new two-story warehouse and office building. Thus, Alternative A-1 is considered to be superior in this resource area.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, Alternative A-1 would have no adverse effects under NEPA, but would have significant impacts under CEQA related to air quality. Alternative A would result in the same residual significant impacts under CEQA related to air quality. After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to biological resources.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to community facilities and services.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to cultural resources.

Neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (CEQA does not apply) related to energy.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to geology and seismicity.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to hazardous materials.

Neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to land use and planning.

Alternative A-1 would result in no adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to noise and vibration. Construction and operation of Alternative A, however, would result in potentially adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to noise and vibration, prior to the implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures. Although implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures would reduce these adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) to

a less than adverse/less than significant level, Alternative A-1 would be considered superior to Alternative A in this resource area.

Neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (CEQA does not apply) related to railroad operations.

Neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (CEQA does not apply) related to safety and security.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, Alternative A-1 would have no adverse effects under NEPA (no significant impacts under CEQA) related to population, housing, and employment. Alternative A would require one more full acquisition and displacement of a business than would Alternative A-1. Thus, Alternative A-1 is considered to be superior in this resource area.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to traffic and transportation.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to utilities.

Neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to visual quality.

After implementation of regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures, neither Alternative A-1 nor Alternative A would result in adverse effects under NEPA (significant impacts under CEQA) related to hydrology and water quality.

3-18 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This section summarizes both surface water and ground water impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. It is based, in part, on the Water Quality Technical Report prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc., included in Volume 3 of this EIR/EIS.

3-18.1 Existing Conditions

3-18.1.1 Regulatory Setting

a. Federal

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as Amended by the Clean Water Act of 1977 (33 USC1251 et seq.)

The federal Water Pollution Control Act (also known as the Clean Water Act [CWA]) is the principal statute governing water quality. The statute's goal is to end all discharges entirely and to restore, maintain, and preserve the integrity of the nation's waters. The act regulates both the direct and indirect discharge of pollutants into the nation's waters. It mandates permits for wastewater and stormwater discharges, requires states to establish site-specific water quality standards for navigable bodies of water, and regulates other activities that affect water quality, such as dredging and the filling of wetlands.

For stormwater or industrial-related discharges into an existing waterway, water quality control is governed by a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Originally NPDES focused on reducing pollutants from discharges from industrial process wastewater and municipal sewage treatment plants. In 1987, CWA was amended to require the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish requirements for regulating stormwater discharges through use of NPDES stormwater permits. In 1990, Section 402(p) was added to CWA to regulate Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) discharges into existing waterways. MS4 systems are now required to obtain an NPDES permit and local jurisdictions are also required to adopt programs that control discharges for new and redevelopment areas.

The major CWA section that applies to activities potentially occurring as part of the proposed project is NPDES Section 402:

Section 402 (33 U.S.C. 1342 and 40 CFR 122): This section of CWA establishes a permitting system for the discharge of any pollutant (except dredge or fill material) into waters of the United States. An NPDES permit is required for all point discharges of pollutants to surface waters. A point source is a discernible, confined, and discrete conveyance, such as by pipe, ditch, or channel.

b. State

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act (Water Code Sections 13000 et seq.)

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act is the basic water quality control law for California. Under this act, the state water resources control board (SWRCB) has ultimate control over state water rights and water quality policy. The act also established nine regional water quality control boards (RWQCBs) to oversee water quality issues on a day-to-day basis at the regional level. Each regional board is required to adopt a water quality control plan or basin plan that reflects the regional differences in existing water quality, the beneficial uses of the region's ground and surface water, and local water quality conditions and problems. The proposed project site is located within the Los Angeles Region (Region 4) that is addressed by the Los Angeles Regional Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura counties.

The boards implement the permit provisions (Section 402) and certain planning provisions (Sections 205, 208, and 303) of CWA. This means that the state issues one discharge permit for purposes of both state and federal law. Under state law, the permit is officially called Waste Discharge Requirement. Under federal law, the permit is officially called an NPDES General Permit.

Beginning March 10, 2003, EPA and SWRCB regulations began regulating discharges from projects with soil disturbance of 1 acre or more by amending the general permit that originally regulated soil disturbances of 5 acres or more. SWRCB Resolution No. 2001-46 also modified provisions of the general permit to require permittees to prepare a specific water quality sampling and analysis plan including analytical procedures for covered construction sites.

In addition, Section 303 (d) of CWA requires the state to develop a list of "impaired" water bodies that may require additional protection (beyond traditional short-term and long-term control) to ensure established water quality standards are achieved and maintained. For these water bodies, states are required to develop appropriate total maximum daily loads (TMDLs). TMDLs are the sum of the individual pollutant load allocations for point sources, nonpoint sources, and natural background conditions, with an appropriate margin of safety for a designated water body.

c. Local

Both the NPDES General Permit for construction activities and MS4 are enforced at the regional level by RWQCBs. Specific local requirements, however, are defined at the local jurisdiction level. The determining factor whether the proposed project is subject to the California Department of Transportation (Department) MS4 Permit or the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit is whether the project is being constructed on property under Department jurisdiction or Los Angeles County/City jurisdiction. If it is both, the proposed project is potentially subject to both permits' requirements. At the time of preparation of this EIR/EIS, it is anticipated that project proponents will file for State General Construction NPDES Permit coverage and have the Department file for Notice of Construction. A redundant application may also occur for the MS4 Permit (Department and Los Angeles County). For purposes of the following, the MS4 permits requirements are detailed for Los Angeles County.

**National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES)—
Department**

In 1996, the Department requested that SWRCB consider adopting a single NPDES for all activities, properties, and facilities that would cover both MS4 requirements and the statewide Construction General Permit requirements. The permit is intended to cover all Department activities that require a current MS4 permit and construction activities that require a federal permit.

In its request for a single NPDES permit, the Department created a stormwater management program (SWMP). The intent of SWMP is to reduce or prevent pollutants in stormwater discharge and authorized non-stormwater discharges through the development and implementation of best management practices (BMPs). SWMP must also comply with the local Municipal MS4 Storm Water Permit for the region in which the project is located. The BMPs chosen must comply with either maximum extent practicable or best available technology economically achievable/best conventional technology standards, whichever is applicable. There are three categories of BMPs in SWMP:

- Technology-based and pollution prevention controls, including maintenance and design BMPs
- Construction controls
- Treatment controls.

The intent of the combined permit is to assure consistency with state construction-related requirements and municipal MS4 requirements. Following is an overview of the requirements for each of these components:

□ General Permit for Construction Requirements

The General Permit requires all dischargers where construction activity disturbs 1 acre or more to:

- Develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies BMPs to prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and with the intent of keeping all products of erosion moving offsite into receiving waters
- Eliminate or reduce non-stormwater discharges to MS4s and other waters
- Perform inspections of all BMPs.

It is the responsibility of the discharger to obtain a General Permit before any soil disturbance. The discharger must submit a notice of intent (NOI) to SWRCB. Coverage under this permit shall not commence until the discharger develops an adequate SWPPP for the project.

The SWPPP must be implemented at the appropriate level to protect water quality at all times throughout the life of the project. The major objectives of SWPPP are to:

- Identify all pollutant sources, including sources of sediment, from the construction site
- Identify non-stormwater discharges
- Construct and implement BMPs to reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater discharges and authorized non-stormwater discharges
- Develop a maintenance schedule for all post-construction BMPs designed to reduce or eliminate pollutants.

The General Permit requires development and implementation of a monitoring program. The program must be implemented at the start of construction activity. The monitoring program must include inspections that obtain these goals:

- Identify areas contributing to stormwater discharge
- Evaluate whether BMPs identified in the SWPPP are adequate and functioning properly
- Evaluate whether additional control practices or corrective maintenance activities are needed
- Development of a sampling and analysis plan that accurately identifies potential sources of pollutants and the locations where these pollutants have the potential to discharge offsite.

☐ **Los Angeles County MS4 Permit Requirements**

Los Angeles County's Municipal Storm Water Permit requirements fall under NPDES No. CAS614001. The primary objectives of the local stormwater program requirements are to:

- Effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges, and
- Reduce the discharge of pollutants from stormwater conveyance systems to the maximum extent practicable (MEP statutory standard).

The primary goal of the permit is to stop polluted discharges from entering the storm drain system and local receiving and coastal waters. A requirement of the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit is implementation of standard urban stormwater mitigation plans (SUSMPs) and numerical design standards for BMPs, which municipalities began implementing in February 2001. The general requirements of the SUSMP include:

- Controlling peak stormwater runoff discharge rates
- Conserving natural areas
- Minimizing stormwater pollutants of concern

- Protecting slopes and channels
- Providing storm drain stenciling and signage
- Properly designing outdoor material storage areas
- Properly designing trash storage areas
- Providing proof of ongoing BMP maintenance.

□ **Drainage and Flood Control Improvements**

Drainage and flood control structures and improvements in the County of Los Angeles are subject to review and approval by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW), while structures and improvements in the City of Los Angeles are subject to review and approval by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (DPW), Bureau of Engineering. In general, the county maintains the large regional channels, and smaller storm sewers are maintained by the city.

Both agencies utilize design standards to provide a specified level of protection against flooding for different types of land use. Both LACDPW and DPW regulate drainage-related improvements through plan approvals and permits. Both agencies require project proponents to design stormwater collection and conveyance systems using specifications and procedures set forth in their respective storm drain design manuals. The project plans and specifications are submitted to the appropriate jurisdictional agency for review and approval. The agency review includes an evaluation of the effects of the project's discharge on the agency's jurisdictional drain system. Projects resulting in stormwater flows that exceed the drainage system's capacity are not approved. In such cases, methods for reducing impacts to the storm drain system can include controlling peak and total discharge through stormwater detention or increasing site perviousness.

3-18.1.2 Surface Water

a. Hydrologic Unit and Watershed

For planning purposes, RWQCB divides surface waters into hydrologic units, areas, and subareas. The project site is located within the Los Angeles-San Gabriel Hydrologic Unit. This drainage areas covers most of Los Angeles County and totals 1,608 square miles. Land use within this area is predominantly developed as residential, commercial, and industrial; much of the area is covered with semi-permeable or non-permeable material (i.e., paved). The Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, and Ballona Creek are the major drainage systems within this hydrologic unit. These systems drain the coastal watersheds of the Transverse Ranges, as well as recharge large reserves of groundwater that exist in alluvial aquifers.

b. Precipitation

Precipitation in the Los Angeles Region generally occurs as rainfall, although snowfall can occur at high elevations. Most precipitation occurs during just a few major storms. Large precipitation variations exist within Los Angeles County. The annual rainfall at the Ducommun Street rain gauge in the City of Los Angeles is 15.5 inches/year (based on measurements between 1872–1993).

c. Water Quality

Major surface waters in the Los Angeles Region flow from head waters in pristine mountain areas through urbanized foothill and valley areas, high-density residential and industrial coastal areas, and terminate at highly utilized recreational beaches and harbors. The Los Angeles River is highly modified, having been lined with concrete along most of its length by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This river runs along the project area to the east and is concrete-lined in the vicinity of the project. Because the watershed is highly urbanized, urban runoff and illegal dumping are major contributors to impaired water quality in the Los Angeles River and tributaries.

Beneficial Uses

Beneficial uses are the cornerstone of water quality protection under the basin plans. Once beneficial uses are designated, water quality objectives and programs are established to maintain or enhance the protection of the designated uses. The proposed project is located within Reach 2 of the Los Angeles River. Designated surface water beneficial uses for this reach are as follows:

- MUN—Municipal
- GWR—Ground water recharge
- IND—Industrial
- REC1—Water contact recreation
- REC2—Non-contact water recreation
- WARM—Warm freshwater habitat
- WILD—Wildlife habitat
- WET—Wetland habitat.

Existing Water Quality

The majority of the Los Angeles River Watershed is considered impaired due to a variety of point and nonpoint sources. The 2002 303(d) list implicates ammonia, coliform, lead, scum, algae, oil, nutrients, odors, and trash in that impairment. Impairment may be due to water

column exceedances, excessive sediment, high levels of pollutants, or bioaccumulation of pollutants. The beneficial uses threatened or impaired by degraded water quality are aquatic life, recreation, ground water recharge, and municipal water supply.

The basin plan provides specific water quality objectives for inland surface waters. The applicable, quantified objectives are included in the Water Quality Technical Report (Table 2-1, Appendix J in Volume 3).

In September 2001, a trash TMDL was established for the Los Angeles River Watershed. According to the basin plan, the narrative water quality objectives applicable to this TMDL are: (1) floating materials—“Waters shall not contain floating materials, including solids, liquids, foams, and scum, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses” and (2) solid, suspended, or settleable materials—“Waters shall not contain suspended or settleable material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.” The numeric target for this TMDL has, therefore, been set as *zero* trash in the water. This target must be achieved by Municipal Storm Water NPDES permittees, including the Department, through a phased reduction (10 percent/year) over a 10-year period.


3-18.1.3 Floodplains and Drainage

a. FEMA Floodplains

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) identify those areas located within the 100-year flood boundary. The 100-year flood is defined as a flood level with a 1 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any 1 given year. “Special Flood Hazard Areas” are subdivided into four insurance risk zones: A, B, C, and X. Areas designated as Zone A are subject to inundation by a 100-year flood. Zones B, C, and X are areas that have been identified as areas of moderate or minimal hazards from the principal source of a flood in the area. The applicable FIRM map designations for the project area are shown on Figure 3-18.1. This FEMA panel was revised in July 1998 and shows that the 100-year flood boundary does not extend over the west bank of the Los Angeles River in the project area. The entire project area is located within Zone X, Areas of Minimal Flooding.


b. Existing Drainage Facilities

Existing drainage areas and storm sewers are shown on Figure 3-18.2. The Union Station track area (Drainage Areas A1, A2, and A3) is drained by a series of 8-inch-diameter perforated corrugated metal pipes, with one pipe between each set of tracks. These pipes run parallel to existing tracks and collect runoff from the tracks and canopies over the platforms. The 8-inch pipes carry runoff to three 30-inch reinforced concrete pipes that run perpendicular to the tracks. These three reinforced concrete pipes flow to different points, creating three subwatersheds for the station track area.



Source: FEMA, 1980, revised 1998.

Figure 3-18.1: Project Area Floodplain Map



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-18.2: Existing and Proposed Storm Drains

The northernmost part of Union Station is called Drainage Area A1. This area drains to a 30-inch reinforced concrete pipe that flows east and connects to an existing storm drain in Vignes Street. The central part of the station track area is called Drainage Area A2. Flow from this area is directed east and then north, connecting to an existing storm drain in Cesar Chavez Boulevard. The existing storm drains in Vignes Street and Cesar Chavez Boulevard eventually drain to the Los Angeles River. The southernmost part of the station track area (called Drainage Area A3) flows to a 30-inch reinforced concrete pipe that runs east and then south into an existing storm drain under the El Monte Busway. This storm drain flows southwest and empties into a 12-foot-diameter reinforced concrete arch culvert. The 12-foot arch culvert is a regional drainage facility that eventually discharges to the Los Angeles River.

South of the station, the tracks would run on an elevated structure and eventually connect to the BNSF yard on the west side of the Los Angeles River. The existing drainage patterns in this area are defined by the existing network of catch basins and storm drains. Drainage Area B is served by storm drains that drain to a 30-inch storm drain running east on Ducommun Street. This storm drain continues east and discharges to the Los Angeles River. Drainage Area C lies to the northeast of Drainage Area B and drains to a 16-inch storm drain running east in Commercial Street, which also continues east and discharges into the Los Angeles River. At the southern end of the project, Drainage Area D drains to an existing 21-inch storm drain that runs east along 1st Street and discharges into the Los Angeles River.

3-18.1.4 Groundwater

a. Local Groundwater Conditions

The project site is within the Los Angeles Coastal Plain Ground Water Basin. The general quality of groundwater has been degraded due to land uses that utilize contaminants that seeped into the subsurface. Commercial and industrial groundwater contaminant sources include leaking aboveground and underground storage tanks containing various and large quantities of hazardous materials. Pesticides, fertilizers, improperly treated septic tank discharges, and illegal discharges are also sources of pollutants.

Groundwater in the project area is generally considered drinking-water quality for inorganic constituents, but is likely to contain organic contaminants from solvent and petroleum pollutions associated with industrial activities in the area.

b. Beneficial Groundwater Uses

Designated beneficial uses for groundwater within the project area (Central Basin area of the Los Angeles Coastal Ground Water Basin) include municipals uses, industrial process supply, industrial service supply, and agriculture. Quantified groundwater quality objectives for regional groundwaters, including the Central Basin, are included in the Water Quality Technical Report in Volume 3.

3-18.2 Environmental Impacts

3-18.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The quantity of runoff was calculated using the methodology described in the LACDPW Hydrology Manual. Based on the guidance of the Hydrology Manual, runoff flows were calculated using the simplified version of the Modified Rational Method for Small Developed Drainage Areas. This method accounts for the applicable soil classification for the area and the annual 50-year rainfall to produce design Capital Flood peak flows for areas up to 10 acres in size. The drainage system was designed (e.g., pipe sizes) based on the City of Los Angeles' Storm Drainage Design Manual

The phased construction plan by subarea was reviewed to determine potential sedimentation and pollutants that could enter drainage facilities. Operational impacts were assessed for potential increases in pollutants and/or introduction of contaminants in new development areas associated with the proposed project. Potential impacts were assessed per applicable regulations as detailed in Section 3-18.1.

3-18.2.2 Impact Criteria

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR/EIS, the proposed Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project Alternatives would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact with respect to hydrology and/or water quality if the project:

- Results in a substantial and adverse increase in inundations, sedimentation, and/or damage from water forces to the subject property or downstream areas
- Adversely affect the collection and conveyance of runoff and sediment
- Substantially degrades or alters groundwater or surface water quality
- Results in runoff from the project area that would adversely affect designated beneficial uses in the runoff receiving watershed, or substantially affect public agency efforts to improve currently recognized conditions of water quality impairment.

3-18.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative would not involve construction activities and, therefore, there would be no construction-period impacts.

b. Alternative A

Drainage

During construction, stormwater from rain events would be collected and conveyed to the existing storm drain system. The project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns

and would not increase flows. Because the entire drainage area is already impervious, and because construction of the proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface area in the local drainage basin, the proposed improvements would not increase the amount of stormwater runoff that is collected in stormdrains and ultimately discharged to the Los Angeles River.

Water Quality

Project construction would include the following major phases:

- Stage 1: Union Station Modification and Utility Relocation
- Stage 2: Realignment of baggage access road, MTA yard lead, and BNSF tracks, and the construction of bridge bents (piles foundations.)
- Stage 3: Construct Platform Nos. 7 and 8 and station facilities; construct bridge superstructure and MSE walls
- Stage 4: Complete track work and signals.

Each of these construction stages includes activities that could potentially affect surface water and/or groundwater quality. Grading activities would involve the operation of heavy equipment and cutting of shallow excavations. Although the project site is relatively flat and the potential for soil erosion is considered to be low, stormwater runoff could result in short-term sheet erosions within areas of exposed or stockpiled soils. Furthermore, the compaction of soils by heavy equipment may reduce the infiltration capacity of soils and increase runoff and erosion potential. If uncontrolled, soil materials could result in engineering problems, including the blockage of storm drainage channels and downstream sedimentation.

Construction activities for Stage 1 include removing existing track materials in the throat area, including creosote ties, rails, wire, metal materials, and track. It is expected that excavated dirt may be contaminated with lead, copper, chromium, and other contaminants typical of a railroad yard. Surface runoff exposure to soils containing these contaminants could pollute water quality of the Los Angeles River. Similarly, during this phase tainted soil may be subject to erosion from storm events during the demolition of the existing Mail Facility.

Stage 2 construction would include drilling piles for each bent. Cast-in drilled hole piles support the columns, which are bolted to the pile caps. Each pile would be 60 to 80 feet deep. Groundwater may be encountered and may be contaminated. If not addressed properly, the groundwater extracted from the pile could substantially degrade surface water. Improper handling of concrete mix could be carried away by runoff and also result in degradation of surface water.

Stage 3 activities would include excavation within the existing station platform area, construction and placement of the bridge, and construction of the MSE walls. Potential water quality degradation concerns would include uncontrolled erosion of excavated soils, litter, and protection of existing storm drain inlets.

Stage 4 activities would include the placement of train tracks on the bridge and completion of signal work. Construction materials and waste management would be important to control potential water contamination.

Construction of the various project components could result in increased erosion to substantial degradation of water quality.

Flood Hazard

The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain and, therefore, construction activities would not be subject to flooding.

c. Alternative A-1

The construction-related impacts for this Alternative would be similar to those associated with Alternative A. This Alternative, however, would require the demolition of the Friedman Bag building at 801 Commercial Street. There is a potential for hazardous materials to be present on this site, which could result in degradation of certain water quality of the Los Angeles River if uncontrolled erosion occurs.

3-18.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the proposed project would not be built, and no additional storm drainage, improvements, or water quality measures would be built. Existing drainage patterns and runoff quantities would remain the same. In addition, the quality of urban runoff pollutants would remain unchanged. An increase in the number of trains would be expected to occur through 2010, at which point existing improvements at Union Station could not accommodate additional traffic. Under this Alternative, future passengers that would be accommodated under the proposed project after 2010 would likely commute via automobiles or alternative mass transit (buses). The increase in additional vehicle miles traveled on existing roadways would incrementally increase the amount of relocated pollutants that could taint surface waters in the region. Potential water quality impacts would result if water quality were insufficient to treat an increase in hydrocarbons and other motor vehicle-related pollutants.

b. Alternative A

Storm Drainage

The proposed drainage system of the bridge structures under Alternative A was designed in accordance with the City of Los Angeles' Storm Drainage Design Manual. Figure 3-17.2 shows proposed drainage improvements for Alternative A. The existing drainage systems in the project area would be used to carry water from the project site into downstream storm drain systems and eventually to the Los Angeles River. Drainage patterns would not be altered, as the project area is almost entirely covered in impervious material and the addition of the proposed project would not substantially increase runoff quantities. Minimal improvements are required to the existing

system. As shown on Figure 3-17.2, inlets and downspouts would be provided along the bridge superstructure to drain surface water to the existing stormwater system. The drainage system within the Union Station track and platform area would remain the same. New drains would be constructed as necessary to connect to the existing system.

Since project implementation would result in negligible (if any) additional impervious areas that could result in additional runoff, there would be no increase in the quantity of surface runoff to be accommodated by the existing storm drains.

Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed project would accommodate more than 100 additional passenger trains per day through Union Station. The additional trains would marginally increase the probability of oil and grease pollutants and potential fuels leaks associated with the increased number of tracks and trains. Although contaminants from leaks or spills would pass through the ballast and into the local storm drain network and ultimately discharge to the Los Angeles River and the Pacific Ocean, the amounts are expected to be marginal. The additional 100 plus train/day capacity would also increase human activity, most notably at Union Station, which would likely lead to an increase in pollutants, such as trash and debris, generated at the station.

Water quality impacts related to spills during fueling operations would not occur at Union Station because trains are fueled offsite. The same is true for maintenance activities performed on trains. Additional landscaping is not proposed as part of this project, and as such, fertilizers and pesticides would not have the potential to impact surface water or groundwater quality. Erosion and sediment-related discharges are also negligible since the proposed improvements are all impervious structures.

Flood Hazard

The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain and, therefore, no long-term, operational impacts are anticipated with respect to flooding.

c. Alternative A-1

Storm Drainage

Proposed drainage improvements for this alignment are shown on Figure 3-18.2. Impacts to the existing storm drainage systems would be the same as for Alternative A. Minimal improvements would be required.

Water Quality

Potential water quality impacts associated with Alternative A-1 are similar to those discussed for Alternative A.

Flood Hazard

The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain and, therefore, no long-term, operational impacts are anticipated with respect to flooding.

3-18.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

a. Storm Drainage

The land within the drainage areas for the proposed project is developed primarily for commercial and industrial uses. With the exception of a few unimproved dirt parcels, the land is paved and impervious. The potential for future development in the project area to increase impervious surfaces and increase runoff is negligible. As detailed in Section 2-3, several local and regional transportation projects are in various planning stages near the proposed project. As with the proposed project, surface runoff from these developments would likely be accommodated by the existing storm drainage system. Final engineering for each project would have to address any potential increased flows and peak concentrations.

b. Water Quality

Potential water quality affects of related projects would be similar to the proposed project. Development of related projects could combine with impacts from the proposed project to result in adverse or significant cumulative impacts to both surface water and groundwater quality. Construction activities could likely result in erosion and sedimentation affects. As with the proposed project, the identified, related transportation projects in the vicinity would be characterized by long-term construction periods involving heavy equipment and substantial quantities of varied construction materials. Construction management and diligent “housekeeping” would be required to minimize water quality impacts.

An increased intensity of road and railway projects in the vicinity would increase the potential for related water quality impacts on a long-term basis. Increased train and motor vehicle traffic could result in an increase in hydrocarbon pollutants and litter.

c. Flood Hazard

The project area west of Los Angeles River is not within the 100-year floodplain. Related projects in the area, therefore, are not anticipated to be subject to flood hazards or combine with the proposed project to result in a cumulative flood hazard impact.

3-18.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternative A

□ NPDES General Permit for Construction Activities

The project proponent must comply with the provision of the combined Department Permit (Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ). Compliance with the General Permit requires the following for the project:

- Development and implementation of an SWPPP that specifies BMPs that would prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater, with the intent of keeping all products of erosion moving offsite into receiving water
- Elimination or reduction of non-stormwater discharges to MS4s and other waters
- Perform inspections of all BMPs
- Development and implementation of a monitoring program, including inspections that obtain these goals:
 - Identify areas contributing to stormwater discharge
 - Evaluate whether BMPs identified in the SWPPP are adequate and functioning properly
 - Evaluate whether additional control practices or corrective maintenance activities are needed
 - Development of a sampling and analysis plan that accurately identifies potential sources of pollutants and the locations where these pollutants have the potential to discharge offsite.

Recommended BMPs to be included in the SWPPP include:

1. Proper stockpiling and disposal of debris, concrete, and soil from demolition activities
2. Stabilizing construction site entrances prior to soil disturbing activities
3. Protecting existing storm drain inlets
4. Erosion controls
5. Proper management of construction materials (e.g. concrete mixing for pillars)

6. Waste management (debris from demolition activities) and active litter control
7. Authorized disposal of removed ballast debris

Project impacts are not anticipated to be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) upon compliance with required regulatory requirements.

Alternative A-1

Regulatory measures for Alternative A-1 and residual impacts after implementation of required regulatory measures would be the same as detailed for Alternative A.

b. Long Term

Alternative A

☐ Los Angeles County MS4 Permit Requirements

Los Angeles County's Municipal Storm Water Permit requirements fall under NPDES No. CAS614001. A requirement of the county's municipal stormwater permit is implementation of an SUSMP. BMPs must be incorporated into new development and redevelopment projects to ensure that stormwater pollution is addressed. Recommended structural and non-structural BMPs proposed for the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project include:

Non-structural Mitigation Measures

- Training employees on stormwater pollution prevention on an annual basis to ensure adequate litter patrol and litter management, proper material storage, and other related good housekeeping practices.
- Implementation of an approved trash removal program by Amtrak and SCRRA to supplement their existing site maintenance program/protocols.
- Education of property owners.
- Regular inspection and maintenance (at least once before the rainy season) of all storm drain inlets, catch basins, and other structural and non-structural BMPs at the project site.
- Development of a spill contingency plan, if not already in place, for fuel spill accidents occurring through operations of the project site.

Structural Mitigation Measures

- "No littering" signage at areas of the project site near the Los Angeles River.

- Storm drain inlets and catch basins to provide a permanent storm drain message, “No Dumping–Drains to the Ocean,” or other approved message to convey that discharges drain untreated directly to the ocean for all new or modified catch basins.
- Increasing the number of trash receptacles to accommodate the increase in activity provided by the improvements.

Project impacts are not anticipated to be adverse (under NEPA)/ significant (under CEQA) upon compliance with required regulatory requirements.

Alternative A-1

Regulatory measures for Alternative A-1 and residual long-term impacts after implementation of required mitigation would be the same as detailed for Alternative A.

3-18.3 Potential Mitigation

Compliance with existing regulatory requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not adversely affect the collection or conveyance of runoff and sediment. Existing regulatory requirements would also ensure that the proposed project does not substantially degrade or alter groundwater or surface water quality. Existing regulations mandate specific requirements for SWPPP and monitoring of construction activities. Similarly, approval, oversight, and potentially long-term monitoring under the Los Angeles County SUSMP requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not adversely affect beneficial uses or impede public agency efforts to improve water quality.

These conclusions apply to both Alternatives A and A-1 for construction-related and long-term environmental affects. Upon compliance with existing regulatory requirements, the hydrological and water quality impacts associated with the project, as well as cumulative impacts, are not anticipated to be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

Aside from required regulation measures, no mitigation measures are proposed.

3-17 VISUAL IMPACTS

3-17.1 Existing Conditions

The proposed project would originate at Los Angeles Union Station, located in the northeastern portion of downtown Los Angeles within the city's Metro Center district at the juncture of Alameda Street and U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101). Union Station Passenger Terminal and certain adjoining station structures are designated as City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Monuments, and are individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Abutting Union Station on the east is the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Gateway Center, which contains an office tower, as well as stations for the regional bus and subway system at its basement and ground level. U.S. 101 and dedicated freeway bus lanes known as the El Monte Busway abut Union Station on the south (see Figure 3.17-1).

The area of potential visual impact extends over several blocks, bounded by North Alameda Street on the west; Hewitt, Jackson and East 1st streets on the south; the west border of the Los Angeles River/Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad main line (rail yard) on the east; and railroad tracks within Union Station extending northeast to Mission Tower, where they join the BNSF main line. Although outside of the area of potential visual impact, two historic properties adjoin Union Station. One of these is El Pueblo State Historic Park, located across Alameda Street to the west of Union Station. It is a grouping comprised of a plaza and 19th and early 20th century historic buildings, some of which are among the oldest extant buildings in Los Angeles. The second of these is Terminal Annex, located across Cesar Chavez Avenue north of Union Station. This is Los Angeles' former central post office and mail facility. The complex is comprised of an architecturally significant large double-domed Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival building (1937-38; G. Stanley Underwood, architect), as well as newer auxiliary parking structures and buildings (north) that are considered neither architecturally nor historically significant. Built concurrently with Union Station, Terminal Annex continues to overlook the station's track area at the rear and along its side elevations as it has since the station's inception.

The project setting is heavily urbanized in character, with land uses that include mostly commercial, heavy and light industrial, and government agency facilities (federal and local government offices and storage facilities, as well as the Los Angeles County Jail). Union Station is abutted on the south by U.S. 101, its offramps, and the El Monte Busway. U.S. 101 serves as a demarcation line defining the neighborhood in which Union Station is located (see Figure 3-17.2). U.S. 101 and the busway are at a lower grade than the station's platform, necessitating the construction of a bridge over the highway and thus introducing a new aerial visual element. The proposed project would extend four of the terminal's 10 tracks over U.S. 101 on a bridge and trestle in an S-curve to the southeast. After traversing the highway, the proposed project structure would remain elevated (Trestle Segment) along two potential alignments, both of which run east along Commercial Street, ultimately touching down within the BNSF main line, north of the 1st Street Bridge.




Figure 3-17.1: Birdseye View NE - Station Stub-End



Figure 3-17.2: View East - Proposed U.S. 101 Bridge Location

Improvements proposed as part of the project would be visible from within the U.S. 101 corridor and in a portion of the neighboring industrial neighborhood to the south. Outside the highway corridor, however, the project would not be visible from the north or west.

U.S. 101 is a designated portion of the National Highway System and serves as an interregional/commuter travel highway, carrying an average daily traffic volume of approximately 215,000 vehicles per day for both northbound and southbound directions combined. Major traffic generators include commuters coming to and from Downtown Los Angeles and through traffic destined for Hollywood, the San Fernando Valley, and south central Los Angeles, as well as truck traffic destined for/originating from the downtown Los Angeles industrial districts.

Union Station and the proposed project's area of potential visual effect are located within the Central City North Plan Area, and are addressed in the Alameda District Specific Plan (1996) and the Center City North Community Plan (2000). The Center City North Community Plan calls for several capital improvements intended to speed up traffic flow through the district, and might enhance aesthetics in a minor way. The improvements include the widening of Center Street (between Commercial and Temple streets) due to its substandard roadway width, street pavement restriping, and peak hour parking prohibitions. Establishment of bicycle routes that would connect with destinations outside the district is also under consideration, as is the undergrounding of utilities.

If the Alameda District Specific Plan was implemented, it would include construction at Union Station of more than 6 million square feet of new office and retail space in five buildings, and the partial decking-over of Union Station's platform and track area. This plan includes design standards requiring that new development in the district utilize low-reflectivity design materials in new construction to reduce glare, that all exterior building lighting be shielded, and that parking structures be designed to shield areas outside from vehicle headlights and spillover interior lighting.

Certain street improvements within the subject area are also proposed by the City of Los Angeles, including the extension of Commercial Street east of Center Street over the Los Angeles River to Mission Road as a one-way eastbound thoroughfare east of Vignes Street. The project includes relocation of the eastbound Commercial Street onramp to U.S. 101 from Hewitt Street to Vignes Street.

Those improvement projects proposed as part of the Alameda District Specific Plan and Center City North Community Plans are likely to enhance the appearance of the southern half of the proposed project area. Freeway access enhancements proposed by the Department in this area will ease congestion at freeway onramps and exits, but could also have as yet undetermined minor visual implications.

In addition to the proposed project, the Eastside LRT Extension will add another new bridge structure, extending the light rail transit line from Union Station across U.S. 101. The LRT bridge will cross over U.S. 101 just to the west of the proposed run-through tracks, transitioning from elevated to at-grade along Commercial street and continuing south at-grade along Alameda Street to East 1st Street. The bridge portion of the LRT project will be of light-colored reinforced

concrete construction, and similar in design to other light rail bridges comprising the local LRT system. Completion of construction for the overall LRT project is scheduled to occur in 2010.

Two additional future projects that could be located at Union Station are under tentative consideration. The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is evaluating the feasibility of developing a statewide high-speed rail service, with a potential station stop at Union Station. FRA and the CHSRA plan to issue a draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) in September 2004. Studies for a Maglev transit service are being conducted by the Southern California Association of Governments in cooperation with and with financial support from the FRA. This super-high-speed service is envisioned to include a station stop located above the current Union Station platform area. Although neither project is funded, both the High Speed Rail Authority and Maglev projects could occur in the future.

3-17.2 Environmental Impacts

For the purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact on visual resources if it:

- Substantially degrades the existing visual character or quality of the Union Passenger Terminal and its surrounding setting
- Substantially damages significant visual resources, such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings
- Would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or obstruct scenic views
- Creates substantial shade/shadows that affect shadow-sensitive uses (residences or parks)
- Results in substantial glare that would adversely affect sensitive views in the area or create potential hazards to motorists.

3-17.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

This visual impact assessment follows the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)/Department guidelines for assessing visual impacts associated with transportation projects. The analysis is intended to satisfy the provisions of NEPA and CEQA with reference to visual and aesthetic impacts. NEPA states that it is the “continuous responsibility” of the federal government to “use all practicable means to assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.” After the adoption of NEPA in 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality published NEPA implementation regulations. These regulations direct that an environmental impact statement (EIS) include discussion of “urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment.”

Visual Quality is one of the precepts used to analyze the aesthetic characteristics of a project on the surrounding environment. The FHWA Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects Guidelines utilizes the criteria of vividness, intactness, and unity in assessing visual quality.

“Vividness” is the visual power or memorability of landscape components as they combine in striking and distinctive patterns. “Intactness” is the visual integrity of the landscape and its freedom from encroaching elements. “Unity” is the visual coherence and compositional harmony of the landscape considered as a whole. Views of high visual quality have several of the following five characteristics:

- Topographic relief
- A variety of vegetation
- Rich colors
- Impressive scenery
- Unique natural and built features.

a. Viewsheds

Viewsheds are defined as areas or structures of particular importance that are visible to and from the project site. They may include the natural environment and/or certain features of the built environment.

The area south of U.S. 101 would house the trestle for the proposed project as it travels east to the BNSF/Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) main line along the Los Angeles River. There is little topographic relief in the immediate vicinity of Union Station. Although the terrain gradually ascends to Fort Moore Hill on the northwest, moving both to the east and south in the immediate vicinity of Union Station, the terrain is gently rolling to flat. Neither this portion of U.S. 101 nor any of the surrounding streets is a designated or proposed scenic highway. Views travelling east and west along U.S. 101 (which transitions from an elevated grade east of Union Station to a below street level grade at the station) and adjacent streets are not vivid (memorable) (see Figure 3-17.3). There is little vegetation (only scattered Pittosporum, Ficus, and palm trees near Alameda Street), and no rich colors, impressive scenery, or unique natural features. There are, however, distant, though not especially memorable, views of the bluffs on the Boyle Heights side of the Los Angeles River when looking east. The most noteworthy view is actually from outside the proposed project’s area of potential visual impact—views of the Downtown Los Angeles skyline when looking west from certain vantage points in Boyle Heights and from the 1st Street Bridge (see Figure 3-17.4). These views, however, would not be affected by the proposed project due to its alignment characteristics, trestle siting, and the relative height of intervening development.

The industrial area south of U.S 101 is visually disjointed, and lacks memorable views. Many older buildings that formerly served as visual landmarks for the neighborhood have been torn down (see Figure 3-17.5). There are numerous vacant lots, considerable discontinuity between buildings, several large and medium-sized parking structures scattered throughout the area between Alameda and Garey streets, and large maintenance facility yards (operated by the Gas Company, Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles Traffic Department, and Los Angeles School District). Tall wooden electrical poles are a visual element along most of the streets.



Figure 3-17.3: U.S. 101, View West - Busway/MWD Adjoining




Figure 3-17.4: View West, Downtown - From 1st Street Bridge





Figure 3-17.5: U.S. 101 - View West Circa 1930

b. Landscape Units

To facilitate description of the existing visual setting of the proposed project area, the area of potential visual impact has been divided into smaller visual components termed “landscape units.” Each landscape unit has distinctive visual and land use characteristics. Four landscape units were delineated for that portion of the proposed project located within the area of potential visual impact. These are denoted as Landscape Units A, B, C, and D (Figure 3-17.6). The Mail Facility previously housed along the Gateway Center edge of Union Station is proposed for relocation to the Amtrak Redondo Junction facility. It is treated separately as a fifth landscape unit due to its physical separation from the rest of the proposed project and location more than 2 miles southeast of where the project’s trestle touches down within the BNSF main line near the 1st Street Bridge. The Landscape Units are:

- Landscape Unit A—The Union Station Passenger Terminal and allied structures west of the railroad track and platform area.
- Landscape Unit B—The railroad tracks, platform, and throat area and feeder line up to and including Mission Tower.
- Landscape Unit C—The area bounded by Alameda Street on the west and the BNSF main line on the east, including and extending south from U.S 101. The southern boundary is a jagged line running along Ducommun, Garey, and Jackson streets.
- Landscape Unit D—The BNSF main line along the west border of the Los Angeles River channel between U.S. 101 and the 1st Street Bridge.
- Relocated Mail Facility Landscape Unit—The Mail Facility site at the Amtrak Redondo Junction facility is bounded by Washington Boulevard on the south, 15th Street on the west, and by both the BNSF main line and Los Angeles River on the east.

To evaluate the specific visual resources and viewer sensitivity of the proposed project, each landscape unit was analyzed in terms of visual quality and character, scenic vistas and views, shading/glare, and artificial light. The landscape units are all essentially visually autonomous, as there are generally only sporadic opportunities to look from one assessment unit to another. A qualitative descriptive approach is used to evaluate the visual resources in as objective a fashion as possible.



Source: © 2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/02; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-17.6: Landscape Units

c. Visual Character and Quality

The visual quality and character of the area of potential visual impact for the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project is defined by the natural (e.g., geologic, topographic, and biologic) and built (i.e., buildings and structures) environment. Visual quality is evaluated on the basis of the relative degree of vividness, intactness, and unity. The National Register-listed Union Station Passenger Terminal and its auxiliary features (Landscape Unit A) have high visual quality, possessing vividness, intactness, and a high degree of visual unity. Overall, however, the visual impact area is considered to have a low visual quality because the natural and built features within it are not memorable (vivid), exhibit a low degree of visual unity, and in several instances do not appear intact. In addition, viewer sensitivity is rated only low or moderate in most portions of the visual impact area because most viewers are commuters who acquire only fleeting views of the surrounding neighborhood, and whose focus is on their travel. Office workers who have daily fixed views of the proposed project are considered to have a low-to-moderate level of sensitivity. Even though they have ongoing views, at present the visual setting is of low visual quality and is dominated by roadways, parking lots, railroad tracks, and vacant lots, as well as large institutional facilities and industrial buildings of low architectural quality. Accordingly, these viewers are considered to have only a moderate level of sensitivity to the project's visual outcomes.

Landscape Unit A

Union Station Passenger Terminal is the dominant visual feature within this landscape unit (Figure 3-17.7). The buildings within this unit are strongly related to each other visually in terms of site plan, landscape features, architectural theme, and color. The terminal's fusion of Spanish Colonial and 1930s Moderne is reflected in the parking lot light standards design, paving, and even in the Metropolitan Water District headquarters (built in 1996), which loosely reflects the terminal's design theme and off-white coloration.

The grand public spaces of this portion of Union Station are visually separated from the train platform and track area to the east (Landscape Unit B), which is screened from view by the former Baggage Mail Building and topographic differences (see Figures 3-17.8 and 3-17.9).



Figure 3-17.7: Union Station Terminal - Looking North



Figure 3-17.8: Union Station South Courtyard - View East, MWD Adjoining



Figure 3-17.9: View SE from Old Baggage/Mail Building Parking Lot to Platform Area



Figure 3-17.10: Landscape Unit B, Platform 2 - Looking NW




Figure 3-17.11: Landscape Unit B - View N to Throat Area, Gold Line Ramp/Tracks

Landscape Unit B

Landscape Unit B consists of the station's railroad tracks, platform, and throat area (i.e., the northerly transition area between Union Station and Mission Junction). This portion of Union Station has a utilitarian design character in which the concrete passenger platforms, train tracks, ballasted areas, and the platforms' corrugated metal shed roofs are the dominant visual elements (Figures 3-17.10 and 3-17.11). There is no vegetation of any kind. The Old Express Baggage/Railway Mail Building, Gateway Plaza office tower, and the top floors at the rear and side walls of the Terminal Annex overlook this area. However, it is effectively screened from view from the Union Station Passenger Terminal (Landscape Unit A) and the neighborhoods to the west, north, and south due to the setback Union Station's functional areas from the station's boundaries. Views are also blocked by topographic separation, screening walls, and intervening buildings. Views from this area are generally restricted by the presence of waiting trains, platform roofs, adjoining buildings, and the physical distance of the train boarding area from the property edges (see Figures 3-17.12 and 3-17.13). From the south of the station tracks, near the retaining wall that divides the platforms from the El Monte Busway, there are views to the south. These views are not memorable, however, as they lack vividness and possess a low degree of visual unity.

Landscape Unit C

Landscape Unit C is the largest of the assessment units and consists of U.S. 101 between Alameda Street and the west bank of the Los Angeles River, as well as the neighborhood just south of U.S. 101 bounded by Alameda, Ducommun, Garey, and Jackson streets and the west border of the BNSF main line (see Figures 3-17.14 and 3-17.15). The neighborhood just south of U.S. 101 is where the proposed trestle alignments (Alternatives A and A-1) would occur. This is an industrial area housing utilities plants, factories, warehouses, offices of disparate design, parking structures, and surface parking lots (see Figures 3-17.16 through 3-17.18). The terrain south of U.S. 101 is essentially flat. There are no unique natural features and only a small number of visually interesting built features. Moreover, there is not a rich range of colors, which are generally limited to beige, gray, and brown. In this setting, many older buildings have been torn down and replaced with utilitarian buildings of concrete block construction. Views north to the project lack visual unity. There is an absence of compelling views and vistas with this assessment area. Views north, for example, terminate with U.S. 101, the El Monte Busway ramp, and Piper Technical Center.

Only two buildings and one structure are architecturally significant and of potential interest to persons traveling through this neighborhood. These include the new Department of Water and Power Administration Building near Ducommun Street at Hewitt Street, the four-story brick Friedman Bag Building that adjoins U.S. 101 at the northeast corner of Center and Commercial streets (see Figure 3-17.19), and the 1st Street Bridge.

There are three additional architecturally and/or historically significant buildings located outside the landscape unit, including the General Electric Building (constructed in 1937 and leased since 1996 by the City of Los Angeles Personnel Department), the Hompa Hongwanji Betsun Buddhist Temple at East 1st and Vignes streets, and the Citizen's Ice Company (currently known as National Ice) at 200–234 North Center Street (1891+). Because of their distance from the proposed trestle/bridge structure, and intervening development, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect upon the visual setting of these three buildings is anticipated.



Figure 3-17.12: Landscape Unit B, Platforms 2 and 3 - Looking North



Figure 3-17.13: Landscape Unit B, Platform 2 - Looking SW to Stub -End




Figure 3-17.14: Landscape Unit C - Looking East to New Bridge Location



Figure 3-17.15: Landscape Unit C - Looking West to New Bridge Location



Figure 3-17.16: Landscape Unit C, Commercial and Hewitt Streets - View East



Figure 3-17.17: Landscape Unit C, Ducommun and Vignes Streets - View East



Figure 3-17.18: Landscape Unit C - View North to Run-Through Location



Figure 3-17.19: Landscape Unit C - View North to Vignes Street

Landscape Unit D

Landscape Unit D is located along the west bank of the Los Angeles River channel, bounded on the north by U.S. 101 and on the south by the 1st Street Bridge. Landscape Unit D consists only of the SCRRRA and BNSF intermodal staging yard, which has the capacity to store trains up to 8,000 feet long on each of four tracks. Approximately 32 freight train movements occur here, or nearby, on a daily basis. This area has an industrial character and consists only of train tracks, track beds, and utilitarian rail operations structures (see Figure 3-17.20). This area is not memorable in visual terms, and the views and vistas from this area to communities to the north, south, and east possess a low degree of vividness and visual coherence. Due to its below-grade alignment and intervening development, this rail yard cannot be seen from the west, except for those buildings that border the rail yards. It is largely out of the sight lines of motorists traveling on the 1st Street Bridge and the U.S. 101-Aliso Street Bridge.

Mail Facility Relocation Site

The Mail Facility relocation site is more than 2 miles southeast of Landscape Unit D in a heavy industrial setting. It is bounded by East Washington Boulevard on the south, the BNSF/SCCRA main line on the east, and East 15th Street on the west. The proposed site is within Amtrak's Redondo Junction facility. Due to demolition activity during the previous decade and the realignment of 15th Street, there are few buildings and no landscaping near the Mail Facility relocation property. The closest offsite surviving buildings are located several hundred feet south across Washington Boulevard, or west along Santa Fe Avenue. Each is industrial in character, none is a visual resource, and none has been deemed eligible for National Register or California Register of Historical resources listing. There are no noteworthy views or vistas in this setting, and little visual unity. There is neither a rich range of colors (these are limited to beige, gray, and browns) nor unique natural features.

The 14.8-acre Redondo Junction property is essentially flat, and consists of an asphalt-paved area for the parking of truck trailers, railroad siding areas spread with gravel, and barren, unplanted ground occupied by a handful of railroad operations buildings. The site possesses low visual quality (see Figures 3-17.21 and Figure 3-17.22), and most of the property is at-grade. It is not visible from heavily traveled Washington Boulevard, which is below-grade in this neighborhood. Only two of the buildings—the Amtrak Locomotive Service Offices and the Redondo Junction Watchtower—are architecturally and/or historically significant. These buildings are not part of a historic district, and are the only two that survive from a grouping of historic buildings at this location that once included an unusual locomotive roundhouse. The proposed Mail Facility would be a long narrow building approximately 30 feet wide and 250 feet long. The construction site would likely be approximately 100 feet or more due south of the Locomotive Services Office and several hundred feet west of the Watchman's Tower. Due to the low visual quality of the property, the physical separation from the visual/historic resources at this location, and the fact that no demolition of these resources is proposed, no negative effect on visual resources is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.



Figure 3-17.20: Landscape Unit D - BNSF Mainline from 1st Street Bridge



Figure 3-17.21: Mail Facility Relocation Site - Looking South



Figure 3-17.22: Mail Facility Relocation Site - Looking North

3-17.2.2 Impact Criteria

The visual impacts associated with the proposed project could potentially result from the construction of structures that are not compatible in design with the character of their setting; and/or that would significantly degrade the views of sensitive viewers (i.e., residents and office employees with ongoing views of the project); or that are related to the demolition or modification of buildings or structures that are significant visual resources.

3-17.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Because no improvements in the study area would occur under this Alternative, no project construction-related impacts would result.

b. Alternative A

No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effects would occur as a result of construction-related activities. No construction would occur in Landscape Unit A. Within the track/platform and throat areas comprising Landscape Unit B, a complex staging plan would be devised to minimize disruptions to train service at Union Station. This strategy would also serve to minimize related temporary visual effects. Work would occur during non-peak times (midday and weekends). Occasional minor and transitory visual changes would occur. However, these construction activities would be visible only in certain portions of the passenger platform area and along the tracks leading north out of the station, from the windows of some of the taller buildings in the neighborhood (e.g., Gateway Center), and occasionally from the windows of passenger trains entering and exiting the station. Work at the station would not be visible from William Mead Homes, which is located approximately 500 feet north of the construction area. The construction-related activities would not be seen from Union Station Passenger Terminal and, consequently, would not adversely (under NEPA)/significantly (under CEQA) affect Union Station's visual setting (Landscape Unit A).

Anticipated construction activities would include:

- Reconstruction of Platform Nos. 2 and 3, along with a slight realignment of Tracks 3 through 6
- Construction of new replacement Platform Nos. 7 and 8
- Replacement of railroad tracks, ties, ballast, and switch mechanisms
- Removal of the mail and express facilities (east border of Platform No. 8)
- Removal of and refabrication of portions of the retaining wall that separates Union Station from the El Monte Busway
- Rebuilding of the Service and Baggage Car access road at the south end of Union Station.

With the exception of the passenger platforms, the above-referenced features are not deemed historic fabric. As part of the natural life cycle of transportation facilities, a majority of the platform features have been changed, disturbed, or reconstructed over the years. For instance, many of the station platform canopies were removed and replaced as part of the MTA Red Line tunnel work. Although the El Monte Busway retaining wall is not historic fabric (it was reconstructed to resemble a previous wall), it is considered a visual resource.

Minor stockpiling of prefabricated materials—such as 60- to 120-foot lengths of new rail—would occur alongside the tracks. On weekends, when there is reduced visitor and train traffic, heavy loading forklift vehicles and speed swing-type cranes would be brought into the area trackside to move the stockpiled new rail into place. Over about a 6-month period, small work crews would work on weekends to lay out, join, and tamp down the new rail and build up the roadbed. Due to the abutting development (e.g., Union Station Passenger Terminal buildings, Gateway Center, and Terminal Annex), the above activities would not be visible at street level in the adjoining neighborhood. This work would not obstruct views of Union Station Passenger Terminal or other significant views. In addition, construction work would occur principally during after-hours times when people in adjacent buildings overlooking the track area are less likely to view them. No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect upon sensitive views or scenic vistas would occur as a result of the construction facet of the project.

Partial demolition and reconfiguration of Platform Nos. 2, 3, 6, and 7, and temporary dismantling of the platform canopies, is proposed during the construction phase of the project. Sections of the top portion of the attractive concrete retaining wall at the station's south end at the El Monte Busway are also proposed for demolition to accommodate the bridge over U.S. 101. Large-scale demolition is not proposed. Although actually reconstructed during the late 1980s—and thus not historic fabric—the retaining wall was designed to match the appearance of the original late-1930s wall. The light fixtures atop the retaining wall, however, are original to Union Station and are considered historic fabric. As a preliminary step for the construction process, prior to the lowering of the wall, these light fixtures would be detached and removed to a secure offsite storage location for later reinstallation. Subsequent construction activities would include cutting and drilling into the concrete wall and its steel rebar to remove portions of it, short-term placement of containers for collection of rubble, installation of wood forms for the pouring of new concrete, concrete drilling, and installation of new rebar. Because of their short-term nature, these activities would not have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect on visual resources.

Within the area comprising Landscape Unit C, a complex staging plan would be formulated to minimize impacts to the operation of U.S. 101. Before construction of the run-through tracks bridge, the Department will be widening U.S. 101 and modifying nearby exit/on-ramps. The Department project includes creating a median on U.S. 101. Structural supports for the Eastside LRT Extension, as well as the proposed project would be put in place with the median as part of the Department project. Specific activities in Landscape Unit C would include drilling piles into the ground to accommodate the fabrication of new concrete pier supports for the bridge and trestle. Drilling of holes for Cast-in-Drill (CIDH) pile supports could take approximately 6 to 8 months. Temporary visual disruptions within the setting would include installation of K-rail barricades while holes are drilled for the bridge pier supports, and the presence of construction vehicles and equipment during the course of the construction process. Pile support holes would

be drilled by a large auger-like device. The slurry extruded by the drilling process would be collected by vacuum hose and transferred into Baker tankers parked nearby.

Construction of between 28 and 32 concrete bents to support the trestle is proposed. This concrete work would probably require the nearby presence of flatbed trucks to deliver steel, a crane, as many as 15 concrete trucks, and nearby areas for the storage and stockpiling of materials over the course of approximately 1 year. When not in use during the day, materials and equipment would be stored in secured areas ringed with 1.86- to 2.48-meter-tall (6- to 8-foot-tall) cyclone fencing. Given their temporary, transitory nature, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effects would result from the presence of construction vehicles, equipment, and barricades. No scenic vistas or views would be disrupted or adversely affected.

Within the area comprising Landscape Unit D, approximately 8,000 cubic yards of earth would be removed to lower the track grade for appropriate clearance underneath the 1st Street Bridge. A Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) ramp would be constructed in the rail yard north of the 1st Street Bridge. The MSE ramp would attain a maximum height of approximately 7.75 meters (25 feet) with a 3 percent slope and would be constructed with outer concrete support walls enhanced with fiberglass reinforced concrete panels that can be embossed with decorative patterns and/or textures to achieve better design compatibility with their setting.

The MSE ramp that is to transition the train tracks from the trestle configuration to touchdown in the rail yard would occur about 23.25 meters (75 feet) north of the existing 1st Street Bridge and would not require modification of the bridge's visual character or alteration to its historic fabric. Temporary construction-related changes to the BNSF trackbed underneath the bridge would include repositioning of and/or limited replacement of tracks, ties, and ballast over a 8-month or longer period.

No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect to sensitive views or scenic vistas would occur as a result of the construction facet of the project under Alternative A. Because of their short-term nature, and the low visual quality of the setting (Landscape Units C and D), these construction activities would not have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect on other significant visual resources.

Construction of the replacement Mail Facility at the Redondo Junction property would not have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect on visual resources. This property is in a setting developed with heavy industrial uses and is improved as a rail maintenance yard. The setting is of low visual quality, and neither the construction nor the completed Mail Facility would obscure or block important views or scenic vistas. Nor are there any sensitive viewer groups, as all who are likely to view the construction process would generally have intermittent views (e.g., truck drivers, commuters, and Amtrak employees).

c. Alternative A-1

Construction-related impacts to the Union Station Passenger Terminal (Landscape Unit A) and occurring within the track/platform area (Landscape Unit B) would be essentially the same as described above for Alternative A.

Within the area comprising Landscape Unit C, the primary difference in construction-related impacts is the slightly more trestle alignment. The key difference in construction impacts would be the probable demolition of two buildings located at the northeast corner of Commercial and Center streets (see Figure 3-17.19). The proposed demolition would have to occur to accommodate construction of the trestle structure. Although considered a modest visual resource due to its being a long-standing and familiar neighborhood feature, the oldest building (constructed beginning in 1902) appears ineligible for either the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources due to continuous alteration and modification. For this reason, the building is not considered a significant visual resource, and thus its demolition is not considered adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

Within Landscape Unit D, the primary difference in construction impacts from those posed in Alternative A would be the excavation and removal of approximately 2,500 cubic yards of earth (approximately 5,500 cubic yards less than in Alternative A) in the BNSF main line for track realignment. This earthwork would continue over the entire time period for the construction of the touchdown portion of the trestle, or roughly 8 months or more. During this time, a total of five sets of tracks would have to be shifted laterally one at a time to minimize disruption to train service. Temporary visual impacts would result from excavation and staging work. Given the utilitarian, semi-industrial character of the rail yard and absence of significant views and vistas, neither the excavation work nor the transitory presence of construction equipment amongst the tracks is deemed to be an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect.

No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect to sensitive views or scenic vistas would occur as a result of the construction facet of the project under Alternative A-1. Because of their short-term nature and the low visual quality of the setting (Landscape Units C and D), these construction activities would not have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect on other significant visual resources.

3-17.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Because the proposed project would not occur under this Alternative, there are no associated long-term impacts. Other scheduled projects, however, would result in long-term changes to the visual setting in the short and long term. These include street improvement/beautification projects already under consideration by the City of Los Angeles for widening Commercial Street east of Alameda Street, the proposed Department widening of U.S. 101, the MTA Eastside LRT Extension, the California HSR service, and a regional Maglev project are also under consideration and would introduce major structures to the visual environment.

b. Alternative A

Under Alternative A, no visual resources would be adversely (under NEPA)/significantly (under CEQA) affected by the proposed project. The key visual resource in the APE is the Union Station Passenger Terminal (Landscape Unit A). However, the passenger terminal would not be affected in visual terms because the proposed improvements would occur in the platform area,

and essentially are not visible from the terminal. By contrast, the station's passenger platform area (Landscape Unit B) has more of a utilitarian character and has seen ongoing modification and improvements during approximately the last 25 years. Modifications proposed as part of the project are appropriate upgrading processes characteristic of transportation facilities. The proposed project would not alter the current function of the platform area, nor alter to a significant degree the existing spatial and design relationships of visual components within the platform area (see Figure 3-17.23). The key changes include rebuilding of Platforms Nos. 2 and 3 so that they slope upward toward the south end and incorporate a slight cant near the start of the new railroad bridge over the U.S. 101/El Monte Busway ramps. Notwithstanding the addition of the run-through improvements, the platform area would look substantially as it does today. Due to the topographic difference between the platform/passenger boarding area, as well as the siting of the old express baggage/railway mail section of the station (west) and Gateway Center (east), the platform area is effectively screened from view from the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, with the exception of the new run-through bridge and trestle, the modifications proposed in the platform area would not be visible in the adjoining neighborhood north of U.S. 101.

No scenic vistas or important views would be obscured or disrupted, either in the platform area or in Landscape Units C and D. The views by moderately sensitive viewers (e.g., office employees) would not change significantly from existing conditions. However, the bridge portion of the project proposed south of Union Station (within Landscape Units C and D) would cast a new, rather deep shadow over U.S. 101 due to its width (four tracks wide at inception), bulk (approximately 2.79 meters [9 feet]), and fairly low clearance over the roadway (see Figure 3-17.24). Future projects at Union Station that may include bridges over U.S. 101 include the Eastside LRT Extension, California HSR project, and Maglev project. These combined projects could therefore result in multiple bridge structures being constructed in close proximity to the proposed project, casting multiple shadows over a relatively small area. Just to the west, however, U.S. 101 transitions from an elevated to below-grade configuration and is traversed by numerous wide concrete street overcrossings (e.g., Main and Broadway) (see Figure 3-17.25). Motorists, who are not considered a sensitive viewer group, would experience the new shadows along with numerous other shadows cast by U.S. 101 overcrossings to the west. Therefore, a significant diminution of visual quality would not occur.





Figure 3-17.23: Simulated Redesigned Platform at New Platform Height - View North



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-17.24: Simulated Bridge Over U.S. 101 - Looking East



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-17.25: U.S. 101 - View East from Hill Street

Portions of the El Monte Busway retaining wall would be demolished to accommodate the new railroad bridge over U.S. 101, and the metal butterfly canopies over the platforms would be removed temporarily during construction and later reinstalled. The retaining wall (which dates from the late 1980s) is considered a significant visual feature. However, it is proposed to reconstruct the retaining wall to match the existing design. This would appropriately mitigate the proposed project-related effect of partial demolition. Removal and reinstallation of the platform canopies has occurred for several past improvements at Union Station, yet the essential visual character and design relationships between elements remains the same as originally built.

The proposed project would result in a new structure being built over U.S. 101. However, the views within the area are not of high quality, and neither this portion of U.S. 101 nor the adjacent streets are part of a designated scenic corridor. Because the existing views are not significant and no major visual resources exist, the changes to the visual setting that would result from the project are not considered adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).


The trestle portion of the proposed project as it traverses the neighborhood south of U.S. 101 (Landscape Unit C) would not adversely affect the visual quality of this setting. The neighborhood contains many vacant lots, and parking structures and industrial buildings of low architectural quality. It has also seen substantial demolition and redevelopment activity during recent decades (see Figure 3-17.26). Consequently, no visual resources would be adversely affected by this segment of the project.

Transition for the trestle portion of the alignment into the BNSF/SCRRA rail yard (Landscape Unit D) includes construction of a fairly steep MSE ramp, the shifting of railroad tracks to accommodate new service, and excavation and removal of rail yard soil to lower the overall track elevation. The alignment would cross beneath the 1st Street Bridge—an architecturally and historically significant resource for NEPA/CEQA purposes. Because of its industrial character and low visual quality, the proposed project-related modifications to the rail yard are not deemed adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA). The ramp would carry rail traffic, which is consistent with the visual character and historic use of this setting. Because the MSE ramp is consistent with visual character and function of the rail yard, and because this construction would not diminish the integrity of the 1st Street Bridge's significant design/historic features (i.e., workmanship and materials), no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to the bridge's visual setting or design integrity would occur as a result of the proposed project (see Figure 3-17.27).



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-17.26: Simulated Trestle - View East on Commercial Street



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-17.27: Simulated MSE Ramp - View NW from 1st Street Bridge

c. Alternative A-1

Project effects under Alternative A-1 would be essentially the same as in Alternative A. The difference is the proposed demolition of the buildings located at the northeast corner of Commercial and Center streets. Although considered a familiar visual feature in this neighborhood (Landscape Unit C), the building complex has undergone numerous alterations and was not deemed eligible for either the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. For this reason, the buildings are not considered a significant visual resource, and thus the demolition is not considered an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect.

d. Relocated Mail Facility

Impacts would be the same as stated under Alternative A.

3-17.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

When past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the study area are taken into account, it is unlikely that the proposed project would result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) cumulative impacts.

Only the Union Station Passenger Terminal (Landscape Unit A) possesses a high level of visual quality. Visual quality in the other portions of the area is rather low, and there are no scenic vistas and significant views in this area of the city. Important views, such as of the downtown skyline when viewed from Boyle Heights, would not be affected by the project due to the project's alignment, siting, and intervening development.

Future projects at Union Station or its vicinity may result in multiple bridges being constructed over U.S. 101. These include the Eastside LRT Extension, California HSR project, and Maglev project. The combined projects could therefore result in multiple shadows over a relatively small area. Just to the west, however, U.S. 101 transitions from an elevated to below-grade configuration and is traversed by a number of successive, wide, concrete street overcrossings. This addition of bridge structures and resulting shadow effects is not deemed to be cumulatively significant with respect to existing and foreseeable highway design characteristics in the vicinity, or with respect to the principal viewer group—motorists—whose attention is expected to be on driving in this high-traffic setting.

The demolition of the buildings at 801 Commercial Street was noted previously. As one of the few early 20th century factory structures remaining in the neighborhood (Landscape Unit C), and as a familiar neighborhood feature of long standing, there was concern that it might be an important visual resource meriting retention (in a setting where substantial redevelopment activity has occurred during the last decade or more). A detailed construction chronology of the building complex was prepared (see Chapter 3-5). This research indicated that this facility underwent numerous alterations over time. Due to its loss of historic fabric, it is not deemed eligible for either the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. The buildings are therefore not considered a significant visual resource, and thus the

demolition is not considered an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect. For this reason, demolition of the building is not considered to be cumulatively significant to the visual setting.

The contribution of the proposed project in significantly diminishing the visual quality of the Union Station setting design is not considered individually or cumulatively significant. Future projects, primarily the Alameda Specific Plan, which calls for substantial new development on the Union Station property—including possible decking over of a portion of the platform area—have far greater potential to significantly and adversely affect the visual setting of Union Station.

3-17.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

The framework of mitigation through regulatory compliance is not germane to the visual resources aspect of this particular project. Neither the lead nor co-operating governmental agencies, through specific governing statutes, has ongoing mandated regulatory compliance jurisdiction concerning visual resources in this matter. The protection of visual resources in the Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project has been promulgated through voluntary conformance with FHWA/Department guidelines for assessing visual impacts associated with transportation projects. These provide a methodology for determining whether visual resources exist and whether impacts to those resources are likely to occur as a result of a proposed project. The proposed project as currently conceived is not expected to result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to visual resources.

3-17.3 Potential Mitigation

The visual analysis reported above determined that neither project construction nor the project itself would result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts. For this reason, no mitigation measures are required. It is assumed, however, that efforts would be made to detail the bridge and trestle structure so that they are compatible in color, texture, and overall form with existing U.S. 101 light-gray colored, concrete overpasses and retaining walls. The proposed use of fiberglass reinforced concrete for construction of the bridge and trestle sidewalls would facilitate creating a wide range of designs that would enable aesthetic compatibility.

3-16 UTILITY DISRUPTIONS AND RELOCATIONS

The following section provides an overview of existing public utilities and service systems and discusses potential impacts from the proposed project.

3-16.1 Existing Conditions

Information on existing utilities within the project area is based on the following sources:

- Utility Report–Draft, Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. Prepared by DMJM Harris. May 1, 2003.
- Utility mapping of U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) and public streets (areas outside of Union Station and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway [BNSF] yard) adjacent to the proposed alignments (Psomas 2002). The mapping incorporates planned improvements to Commercial Street.
- As-built information from previous projects within Union Station and the MTA Red Line project (for existing utilities within Union Station and the BNSF yard).
- Utility search through contact with Underground Service Alert (Dig-Alert) and as-built information from utility agencies with interests within the project area.
- Engineer’s field survey and verification of at-grade utilities (e.g., manholes, catch basins, and valve stations) and above-grade utilities (e.g., electrical overhead lines).

Table 3-16.1 lists the existing utility agencies/companies potentially located within the project area. These utilities were contacted for information as part of the project utility study for the 35 percent engineering design (DMJM Harris 2003).

3-16.1.1 Service Providers

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides water and electrical service to the project area. LADWP Central District Headquarters (CDH) is located south of the proposed project alignment(s) and is bounded by Alameda, Ducommun, Gary, and Temple streets. It is the center for all fleet operations for the metropolitan area of LADWP, including construction and 24-hour operations to provide ongoing and emergency water and power supplies to the central portion of the city, primary material and storage center for water systems, and customer and field services. Within the facility are underground fuel storage systems, a recently bid compressed natural gas facility for fueling vehicles, underground power, fiber optics, security systems, and electric vehicle generating cables.

Southern California Gas (SCG) provides gas service to the project area. The Ducommun Street Substation is located south and west of the project alignment(s) bounded by Ducommun Street, Jackson Street, Center Street, and the BNSF yard and tracks that run parallel to the Los Angeles River.

Table 3-16.1: List of Utility Agencies/Companies

| No. | Agency/Company |
|-----|---|
| 1 | AT&T (OSP Engineering and Local Services) |
| 2 | Broadwing Communications |
| 3 | Adelphia Communications (Century Cable) |
| 4 | Chevron |
| 5 | Kinder Morgan Energy Partners/SFPP |
| 6 | LACMTA/RCC |
| 7 | City of Los Angeles (general services, traffic) |
| 8 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power |
| 9 | Level(3) Communications |
| 10 | MCI Worldcom |
| 11 | Media One Communications (ComCast) |
| 12 | Mobil Oil |
| 13 | Pacific Pipeline System, Inc. |
| 14 | SBC (Pacific Bell) |
| 15 | Qwest |
| 16 | Southern California Gas (The Gas Company) |
| 17 | Shell Pipeline |
| 18 | Sprint |
| 19 | Tosco 76 Products |
| 20 | Verizon Wireless (Air Touch Cellular) |
| 21 | Southern California Edison |
| 22 | Williams Communications |

Source: HDR, Inc. 2003.

Sewer service in the project area is provided by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (DPW), Bureau of Sanitation. DPW is responsible for collection, transport, treatment, reuse, and disposal of wastewater from Los Angeles, some county areas, and nine other cities. Wastewater is collected through 6,520 miles of pipeline throughout the service area and treated at the Hyperion and Terminal Island treatment plants, and Tillman and Los Angeles/Glendale water reclamation plants for reuse or discharge to the ocean. The Hyperion plant is the main treatment plant, with 450 million gallons per day capacity, and currently treats 362 million gallons per day through full secondary treatment.

Storm drains in the project area are also maintained by DPW. Stormwater is collected, transported, and disposed through a system of city-owned natural and constructed channels, debris basins, pump plants, storm drain pipes, and catch basins and into the Santa Monica and San Pedro Bays. The Los Angeles storm drain system flows directly to the ocean. Contaminated stormwater receives no treatment because of the sheer volume of runoff from an area encompassing 1,060 square miles.

Communication lines within the project area include various phone lines, fiber optic lines, and cable. Phone service is provided by SBC (Pacific Bell). Cable companies serving Los Angeles include Adelphia Communications (Century Cable) and Media One Communications (ComCast). Cellular, Internet, and fiber optic communications are provided by Sprint, MCI Worldcom, AT&T, Verizon Wireless (Air Touch Cellular), Qwest, Williams Communications, Level(3) Communications, and Broadwing Communications.

Fuel lines within the project area include active and abandoned lines transporting petroleum product (i.e., gasoline and oil) to and from oil facilities, including Union Oil, Chevron, Shell, Tosco 76, Mobil, and Kinder Morgan.

a. Union Station Segment

Utility research in this area shows existing storm drain, steam, air, and water lines within Union Station. A utility corridor runs east-west in the middle of the station approximately 11 feet deep from existing grade to top of the concrete box. It contains water, steam, air, and electrical lines along its length. The existing water and air lines (ventilation) serve the facility locally and are independent of external use.

The storm drain system within Union Station consists of three major (12-, 24- and 30-inch) reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) storm drain lines fed by 8-inch perforated corrugated metal pipe (PCMP) lines along the lengths of Tracks 1 through 13. The three major lines run east-west and parallel to the station's main passenger tunnel. A 30-inch RCP storm drain runs north-south approximately 50 feet north of Platform No. 6. The 8-inch PCMP (north-south) lines collect the runoff on the tracks and adjacent platforms. An existing 24-30-inch RCP storm drain line is located approximately 180 feet north of the passenger tunnel. This line drains to the north-south 30-inch line, which then drains to Cesar Chavez Avenue. A second 30-inch RCP line is located approximately 50 feet south of the passenger tunnel. This line connects to a 30-inch storm drain that eventually connects to the 18-inch slotted storm drain that runs along U.S. 101. The 12-inch RCP line north of Cesar Chavez Avenue receives runoff from 8-inch PCMPs draining the track throat area, and drains to Cesar Chavez Avenue.

The electrical system within Union Station is made up of concrete duct banks and conduits leading to service the platforms. The concrete duct banks are approximately 4 feet below existing grade. The east-west utility tunnel in the middle of the facility serves mainly as an electrical corridor.

Utility research along the south access road indicates the existence of sewer, gas, water, and electrical lines.

b. U.S. 101 Crossing Segment and Trestle Segment

Existing 18-, 30-, and 36-inch storm drain lines run along the U.S. 101 alignment. The 30-inch storm drain line collects runoff from the El Monte Busway and the Union Station facility south of the passenger tunnels. The 18-inch storm drain line collects runoff from U.S. 101. Both lines converge in a double opening catch basin that has a 36-inch discharge pipe. This pipe ultimately leads to the 12-foot by 12-foot arched concrete box storm drain that serves as a major collector storm drain. This storm drain runs east-west parallel to U.S. 101, north-south along Vignes Street, then runs east-west along Ducommun Street and across the railroad tracks north of the BNSF yard, where it outfalls at the Los Angeles River.

Existing utilities under Commercial Street include 4- and 20-inch gas, 6- and 12-inch water, 8-inch sewer, 16-inch storm drain (which drains Commercial Street and discharges to the Los Angeles River), 4-inch oil, and 6-inch SBC communication (Pacific Bell) lines. Overhead

electrical and communication lines run along Commercial Street. The overhead lines are planned for relocation associated with the Commercial Street Widening Project. A 30-inch storm drain and an overhead electrical line run along Ducommun Street. Six-inch water lines (active and abandoned) and 4-inch gas lines (active and abandoned) lie along Garey Street between Commercial and Ducommun streets. Along Vignes Street are 12-inch water, 14- and 16-inch sewer, 24-inch storm drain, 6-inch gas, and communication (4-inch SBC and 1-inch AT&T) lines. Center Street has 6- and 8-inch water; 36-inch storm drain; 2-, 4-, 6-, 8-, 10-, 12-, 16-, 20-, and 30-inch gas (active and abandoned); and 6- and 10-inch fuel (Union Oil) lines.

Within the trestle segment as it veers south are 8-inch water and 2-inch gas lines that run approximately parallel to the tracks within the BNSF yard. An electrical overhead line also runs parallel to this segment east of the tracks. A 20-inch gas line runs along Jackson Street across the BNSF yard, runs south parallel with the railroad tracks within the yard, then turns east perpendicular to the tracks across the river. A 6-inch oil line runs parallel to Jackson Street, across the BNSF yard, runs southwest parallel and outside of the tracks, then gradually crosses back into the railroad ROW. The gas and oil lines are attached to an overhead utility bridge that runs perpendicular and above the BNSF yard tracks.

c. Mail Service Segment

Within the area of the proposed Mail Service Facility, 2-inch and 4-inch water pipes traverse northwest-southeast across the site then northeast to southwest on the east side of the site where it transitions to a 2-inch copper water line. A 4-inch abandoned water pipe also crosses northeast-southwest across the site. A 10-inch fire water line parallels the adjacent tracks and the western boundary of the site. A 4-inch PVC (polyvinyl chloride) storm drain force main runs east-west to an underground (7 feet, 8 inches deep) lift station located at the approximate centerpoint of the site. From the lift station, the line transitions to a 24-inch RCP storm drain that runs north-south and parallel to the outermost yard tracks west of the site. A 4-inch sanitary sewer line (running northeast to southwest) is located east of the Mail Service Facility site. Overhead electrical lines run north-south to the east, and east-west across the site at the southern end. A power substation is located to the southeast and immediately adjacent to the site. A pipeline (size and type unknown) may possibly cross from the approximate northwest corner of the site to the approximate centerpoint of the site.

3-16.2 Environmental Impacts

3-16.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Potential impacts to utilities and services were evaluated in terms of direct impacts by the proposed project to the physical infrastructure and delivery systems associated with the utilities. Locations where construction of the (preferred) Alternative A-1 would intersect existing utility lines/facilities were identified as part of the utility report (DMJM Harris 2003). Utilities requiring relocation and protection in place were identified. The utility report did not analyze the utilities potentially affected by Alternative A; therefore, locations where construction of Alternative A would intersect utility lines are approximate. Indirect impacts to utilities were evaluated in terms of potential disruption to service during construction and additional service requirements generated by the new/modified facilities.

3-16.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. NEPA Thresholds of Significance

The FHWA and FRA have no specific significance threshold relative to utilities.

b. CEQA Thresholds of Significance

The significance thresholds for energy were addressed in the CEQA Initial Study (under Issue 18, Utilities, Energy, and Service Systems). The proposed project would have an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) effect if it would:

- exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board
- require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects
- require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects
- have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed
- result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments
- adversely affect or interfere with the provision of public utility services.

3-16.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, no short-term construction impacts to existing utilities would occur as a result of the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. No physical relocation of utility lines, restrictions on access to service, or interruptions to service would occur. Without the improvements, the existing facilities at Union Station would accommodate projected future use to the Year 2010. After 2010, additional demand and need for services and facilities at the station would increase.

Related transportation projects in the area—MTA Eastside LRT, U.S. 101 widening, 1st Street Bridge widening, and Commercial Street widening—are each likely to result in temporary impacts to utilities within their individual construction zones.

The existing mail transfer facility at Union Station would also remain. If the existing facility were moved as an independent project, then the extension of utility services to the new Mail Service Facility site would occur.

b. Alternative A


Construction of the proposed project would require additions to/modification of existing utility lines associated with Union Station and BNSF track facilities, and public streets within the project area. Prior to construction, exact locations of the affected utilities lines would be located, typically through potholing and coordination with the utility agencies/companies. Table 3-16.2 lists the utilities that would potentially be affected during construction of Alternative A.

Figure 3-16.1 shows the location of potential relocations associated with construction of Alternative A.

Union Station Segment

This area includes the Cesar Chavez Grade Separation, the Union Station platforms and the South Access Road (stations 10+00 to station 27+00). Relocations of utilities are required for three reasons:

- realignment of tracks
- modifications and additions of platforms
- modifications of the South Access Road



Source:

Figure 3-16.1: Impact to Existing Utilities - Alternative A

Table 3-16.2: List of Impacted Utilities – Alternative A

| Location | Station | Utility Type | Active/Abandoned |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Union Station | 10+00 to 27+00 | 8" PCMP Storm Drain | Active |
| Union Station | 10+00 to 27+00 | 2" Water | Active |
| Union Station | 15+00 to 27+00 | Electrical (Platforms) | Active |
| Union Station | 22+50 to 23+20 | 1.5-inch Air | Active |
| South Access Road | 26+96 | Electrical Line | Active |
| South Access Road | 26+96 | Communication Line | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+17 | Gas | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+20 | Sewer | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+27 | Water | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+30 | Electrical | Active |
| U.S. 101 | 27+89 | 18" Storm Drain | Active |
| U.S. 101 | 27+98 | 30" Storm Drain | Active |
| Commercial Street | 32+50 | 4-4" Communication Lines | Active |
| Commercial Street | 41+00 | Overhead Electrical | Active |
| LRT Maintenance Lead | 44+80 | 20" Gas | Abandoned |
| Ducommun Street | 46+50 | 42" Storm Drain | Active |
| Ducommun Street | 46+60 | Overhead Electrical | Active |
| BNSF Yard | 49+00 | 8" water | Active |
| BNSF Yard | 50+50 | 6" Oil | Active |
| BNSF Yard | 53+00 | 20" Gas | Active |

Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Along the Alternative A alignment, the existing storm drain, air, water, and electrical lines would be modified to accommodate reconstructed platforms and realigned tracks. The 8-inch PCMP lines of the storm drain system within Union Station would require relocation wherever track realignment is proposed. Two of the three major RCP storm drain lines potentially would be affected by the platform modifications. The modification of Platform Nos. 3 and 4 would lower the slope of existing ramps and would encroach on the existing 24- to 30-inch RCP storm drain line located approximately 180 feet north of the passenger tunnel. Installations of 8-inch PCMP lines are required to accommodate proposed Tracks 15 and 16.

The concrete duct banks that are approximately 4 feet below existing grade would not be affected by platform modifications or track realignment and would be protected in place. The east-west utility tunnel would not be affected by the platform modifications. The existing water and air lines would require relocation but this would be easily accommodated and the lines would be minimally affected.

The design for the modified South Access Road calls for a significant grade change that would have an impact on existing utilities running underneath the road. The grade change of the South

Access Road would require relocation of the existing sewer, gas, water, and electrical lines. A trench drain and catch basins would be installed along the modified South Access Road. Runoff from the east end would drain to the proposed trench drain to a junction structure with the existing 18-inch line east of Platform No. 8. Flow would run south to the existing 30-inch RCP that joins with the 30-inch RCP along U.S. 101. Runoff from the west would drain to series of catch basins then to an existing 18-inch line (abandoned) along the northern edge of the El Monte Busway.

U.S. 101 Crossing Segment & Trestle Segment

The foundations for the bents supporting the bridge structure over U.S. 101 for Alternative A would be installed from stations 26+70 to station 51+22. The flyover bridge structure has 32 bents, which are supported by 8-foot diameter cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) piles. Storm drain, overhead electrical, telephone and electrical lines would be affected and would require relocation.

The location of Bent 3 of the bridge structure is situated over an existing 18-inch and 30-inch storm drain lines that run along U.S. 101. No impacts are expected to occur to the 12-foot by 12-foot arched concrete box storm drain running east-west parallel to the U.S. 101. This major collector storm drain is accommodated by the proposed location of the bents' foundations. Construction of the bents would avoid impacts to the storm drain's existing condition.

Construction of the trestle portion of this segment would potentially involve the utilities underneath Commercial Street including gas lines, water lines, sewer, storm drain, oil and communication lines. The proposed bridge would cross over U.S. 101 and then turn east, running parallel to and south of Commercial Street. Installation of the outer piling for Bent 8 may require relocation of four 4-inch communication lines. This trestle portion would not cross or affect the LADWP CDH facility. Bent 9 would be located east of Garey Street and would not affect the gas or water lines within the street. This proposed alignment avoids infringing on the length of Commercial Street resulting in minimal utility relocation. Bent 18, located west of Center Street, may impact and require relocation of an overhead electrical line. Bent 19 would be located east of Center Street but would not intersect existing utilities along the street. As the bridge approaches south, crossing over Ducommun Street toward the BNSF yard facility, Bent 24 may impact the 20-inch gas line. The modifications at Bent 24 on the existing LRT Maintenance Yard Lead may require protection by casing of a 20-inch gas line underneath the tracks. Bent 27 may impact a 42-inch storm drain and an overhead electrical line running along Ducommun Street. The 12-foot by 12-foot arched RCB storm drain under Ducommun Street would be protected in place.

The segment along the BNSF yard area runs south and parallels the Los Angeles River to the west. Utilities along this segment would be modified to accommodate the bridge structure, MSE wall, and realigned tracks. Bent 29 would affect an 8-inch water line running laterally along the BNSF yard. The 20-inch gas line that runs perpendicular to and underneath the BNSF yard tracks would require protection by casing. No impact would occur on the overhead utility bridge above the BNSF yard tracks. Modifications to the track may require relocation of a 6-inch oil line running perpendicular across the BNSF yard.

Mail Service Segment

The site of the proposed Mail Service Facility is approximately 30-feet by 250-feet. Excavation of the site for the facility would be approximately 4 to 6 feet deep for footings. Construction would potentially affect existing utility lines underneath the site by protecting the lines in place or relocating the lines. Construction of the facility would potentially involve relocating overhead electrical lines. Extensions of service lines off of existing facilities would be installed to provide power, water, sewer, drainage, and gas services to the Mail Service Facility.

Impacts to Utility Services and Facilities

The proposed project is an elevated rail track structure and expansion of facilities at Union Station. It does not involve new development of residential homes or businesses. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to generate a substantial need for water or produce substantial amounts of wastewater or runoff. Runoff from the project area would drain to the storm drain system. Modifications to existing storm water drainage inlets and facilities would occur where the proposed alignments intersect existing drainage inlets and lines. Extensions of existing lines within the station to serve the additional track facilities at Union Station would be installed. However, the project would not require extensive construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion outside of the existing facilities. Any polluted runoff would need to be collected, treated, and discharged to city sewers. The amount of runoff captured during construction and operation of the station and track facilities is not expected to exceed available storm water drainage capacity of the City's Bureau of Sanitation facilities.

Minimal water use would be generated during construction, however this demand would be short term and temporary. Construction would require water to be brought to the site in water trucks to spray surfaces for dust control. No other substantial amounts of water would be used for construction. The proposed modifications to Union Station would expand the facility and increase passenger travel on the railways. Water usage and demand for wastewater services would increase. It is expected that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and that no new or expanded entitlements would be needed. The project would not generate the need for new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing treatment facilities. The amount of additional wastewater generated during construction and operation of the station and track facilities is not expected to exceed available capacity or wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles RWQCB (Region 4).

The project area contains overhead power lines and underground utilities throughout the entire area. The proposed station modifications would require additional fixtures and electrical lines to be installed for lighting, ticket machines, and speakers. Construction of the proposed elevated structure could require the relocation of some power lines, power poles, street luminaries and/or underground utilities, depending on the selected alignment. The actual work to relocate the power poles would be provided the LADWP. This work could cause a temporary disruption in service to businesses in the vicinity.

c. Alternative A-1


Union Station Segment

Construction of the proposed project would require additions to/modification of existing utility lines associated with Union Station and BNSF track facilities, and public streets within the project area. Prior to construction, exact locations of the affected utility lines would be located, typically through potholing and coordination with the utility agencies/companies. Table 3-16.3 lists the utilities that would be potentially affected during construction of Alignment A-1. Station numbers refer to positions shown on maps in Volume 2 of this EIR/EIS.

| Table 3-16.3: List of Utility Impacts – Alternative A-1 | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Location | Station | Utility Type | Active/Abandoned |
| Union Station | 10+00 to 27+00 | 8" PCMP Storm Drain | Active |
| Union Station | 10+00 to 27+00 | 2" Water | Active |
| Union Station | 15+00 to 27+00 | Electrical (Platforms) | Active |
| Union Station | 22+50 to 23+20 | 1.5-inch Air | Active |
| South Access Road | 26+96 | Electrical Line | Active |
| South Access Road | 26+96 | Communication Line | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+17 | Gas | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+20 | Sewer | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+27 | Water | Active |
| South Access Road | 27+30 | Electrical | Active |
| U.S. 101 | 27+89 | 18" Storm Drain | Active |
| U.S. 101 | 27+98 | 30" Storm Drain | Active |
| Commercial Street | 38+80 to 39+70 | Overhead Electrical | Active |
| Commercial Street | 39+90 | 8-inch Water | Active |
| Commercial Street | 42+50 | 8-inch Sewer | Active |
| Commercial Street | 42+50 | 4-inch Oil | Active |
| Commercial Street | 42+50 | 6-inch Water | Active |
| Commercial Street | 42+50 | (4) 4-inch Communication Lines | Active |
| Commercial Street | 42+50 | 20-inch Gas | Abandoned |
| LRT Maintenance Lead | 44+50 | 20-inch Gas | Active |
| Ducommun Street | 46+00 | 8-inch Water | Active |
| Ducommun Street | 46+90 | Overhead Electrical | Active |
| BNSF Yard | 53+00 | 20" Gas | Active |

Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-16.2 shows the location of potential relocations associated with construction of the A-1 Alternative.



Source:

Figure 3-16.2: Impact to Existing Utilities - Alternative A-1

U.S. 101 Crossing Segment & Trestle Segment

The foundations for the bents supporting the bridge structure over U.S. 101 would be installed from stations 27+40 to station 46+90. The bridge and trestle structure has 28 bents, which are supported by 8 feet diameter cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) piles. Storm drain, water overhead electrical, telephone and electrical lines, sewer and an abandoned gas line would be impacted and would require relocation.

The location of Bent 3 of the bridge structure is situated over an existing 18-inch and 30-inch storm drain lines that run along U.S. 101. No impacts are expected to occur to the 12-foot by 12-foot arched concrete box storm drain running east-west parallel to U.S. 101. This major collector storm drain is accommodated by the proposed location of the bents' foundations. Construction of the bents would avoid impacts to the storm drain's existing condition.

Construction of the trestle portion of this segment would potentially involve the utilities underneath Commercial Street including gas lines, water lines, sewer, storm drain, oil and communication lines. The trestle segment would cross over the U.S. 101 freeway and then turn east, running parallel to and north of Commercial Street. This trestle portion would not cross or affect the LADWP CDH facility. This proposed alignment also avoids infringing on the majority of Commercial Street resulting in minimal utility relocation. The affected utilities along Commercial Street would include relocations of overhead electrical lines between Bents 16 and 17, and an 8-inch water line at Bent 17. A 16-inch storm drain line runs between the two piles of Bent 19 and ultimately discharges to the Los Angeles River. This storm drain would be protected but would be relocated if impact during construction is unavoidable. Utilities impacts at Bent 19 would include an 8-inch sewer, 4-inch oil, 6-inch water and four 4-inch communication lines. An abandoned 20-inch gas line within the area of excavation for Bent 19 would be cut and capped. An overhead electrical and communication (telephone) lines at Bent 20 would require relocation.

As the trestle segment veers south crossing over Commercial Street and Ducommun Street toward the BNSF yard facility, several utilities would be affected. The segment along the BNSF yard area runs south and parallels the Los Angeles River to the west. Utilities along this segment would be modified to accommodate the trestle structure, MSE wall, and realigned tracks. Bents 23 and 24 would affect an 8-inch water line running laterally along the BNSF yard. The alignment would not affect the 42-inch storm drain, overhead electrical line, or the 12-foot by 12-foot arched RCB storm drain under Ducommun Street. A 20-inch gas line would be protected in place over the new LRT Maintenance Yard Lead. The 20-inch gas line that runs perpendicular to and underneath the BNSF yard tracks would require protection by casing. No impact would occur on the overhead utility bridge above the BNSF yard tracks. Modifications to the track may require relocation of a 6-inch oil line running perpendicular across the BNSF yard.

Mail Service Segment

Impacts to existing utilities in this segment of Alternative A-1 would be the same as discussed above for Alternative A.

Impacts to Utility Services and Facilities

Impacts of Alternative A-1 to the provision of utility services and the need for additional facilities would be the same as Alternative A.

3-16.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build Alternative, no long-term operational impacts to existing utilities would occur as a result of the proposed project. No physical relocation of utility lines, restrictions on access to service, or interruptions to the service would occur from the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project. Without the improvements, the existing facilities at Union Station would accommodate projected future use to the Year 2010. After 2010, demand and need for additional capacity and facilities would increase as service capabilities of the station expand and train service increases.

It is assumed that other transportation projects in the study area would not have long-term impacts since utility lines in the vicinity could be modified or relocated to ensure long-term operations.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

No disruptions to service or relocations of utilities would occur during operation of the proposed project for all segments of either alternative. No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would occur to utilities.

3-16.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project in association with the related projects would result in cumulative impacts to existing utilities. Like the proposed project, construction of the related projects (including the proposed Commercial Street Widening and Eastside LRT project) would require utility relocations and protection. Service extensions to serve the projects would also be installed. Temporary, short-term service disruptions would occur during construction. No cumulative long-term service interruptions or additional relocations and service extensions would occur during operation of the related projects.

3-16.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternatives A and A-1

Impacts to utilities would be limited to relocation of lines intersected by the proposed alignment, primarily through excavation associated with the station modifications, and installation of the columns for the trestle bents. Where possible, existing utilities would be protected in place. Service interruptions during the relocations would be temporary and short-term. Potholing to

locate, relocate, and protect utilities in place during construction would be coordinated with the applicable utilities including the LADWP.

Impacts to utilities during construction would be not adverse (NEPA)/less than significant (CEQA).

b. Long Term

Alternatives A and A-1

No project-related disruptions to service or additional relocation of utilities would occur during operation of the proposed project for all segments in Alternative A. Long-term impacts to utilities would be not adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA).

3-16.3 Potential Mitigation

3-16.3.1 Construction Period

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No mitigation is required. Construction of the proposed project would not result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to utilities.

3-16.3.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

No mitigation is required. Operation of the proposed project would not result in long-term adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to utilities.

3-16.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-16.4.1 Construction Period

a. Alternatives A and A-1

Impacts to utilities during construction would be not adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA).

3-16.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

Impacts to utilities during operation of the proposed project would be not adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA).

3-15 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

This section summarizes the results of a study evaluating potential traffic and parking impacts of the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. Please refer to the technical report in Appendix H of this document for additional detail.

3-15.1 Existing Conditions

A comprehensive data collection effort was undertaken to develop a detailed description of existing transportation conditions within the study area, including street system characteristics, traffic volumes, traffic operating conditions, and a summary of public transit services.

3-15.1.1 Existing Street System Characteristics

The street system within the study area is illustrated on Figure 3-15.1. The area in which traffic impacts could occur is a subset of the overall project study area. The traffic study area is within Segment 3, as defined in Section 2-2.2.1.

Diagrams of the existing lane configurations at the study intersections are provided in the technical report in Appendix H of this document. Table 3-15.1 describes characteristics of streets within the traffic study area, such as number of lanes, median type, and parking restrictions.

Access to the study area is constrained by manmade and natural barriers: U.S. 101 to the north and the Los Angeles River to the east. A limited number of roadways cross the Los Angeles River and U.S. 101. Alameda Street and Center Street are north-south roadways that cross U.S. 101 near the project; 1st Street and U.S. 101 are roadways that cross the Los Angeles River near the project.

U.S. 101 is the nearest freeway. It runs east-west in the vicinity of the project, although it is primarily a north-south freeway. Access to and from southbound/eastbound U.S. 101 nearest the study area is via ramps located along Commercial Street at Hewitt and Vignes Streets. Access to and from northbound/westbound U.S. 101 nearest the study area is from ramps located along Alameda, or ramps located on Vignes and Center Streets north of U.S. 101.

The El Monte Busway extends from Union Station in downtown Los Angeles to the suburban community of El Monte, primarily along Interstate Route 10, although it runs parallel to U.S. 101 between Interstate Route 10/U.S. 101 junction and Union Station. The westernmost entrance and exit to the busway is off Alameda Street between Union Station and U.S. 101.

Table 3-15.1: Existing Surface Street Characteristics in Segment 3

| Segment | From | To | Lane | | Median Type | Parking Restrictions | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | NB/EB | SB/WB | | NB/EB | SB/WB |
| Alameda St | 2nd St | 1 st St | 2 | 2 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | 1 st St | Temple St | 2 | 2 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | Temple St | Aliso/Commercial St | 2/3 | 2/3 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| Vignes St | Aliso/Commercial St | Arcadia St | 3 | 3 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | 1 st St | Banning St | 1 | 1 | SDY | 2 HR PA 8A-6P | 2 HR PA 8A-6P |
| | Banning St | Temple St | 1 | 1 | SDY | 2 HR PA 8A-6P | 2 HR PA 8A-6P |
| | Temple St | Jackson St | 1 | 1 | SDY | 10 HR PA 6A-4P | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| | Jackson St | Ducommun St | 1 | 1 | SDY | 10 HR PA 6A-4P | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| | Ducommun St | Commercial St | 1 | 1 | DY | 10 HR PA 6A-4P | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| Center St | 1 st St | Banning St | 1 | 1 | DY | NSAT | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| | Banning St | Temple St | 1 | 1 | DY | RZ, NSAT | NSAT |
| | Temple St | Jackson St | 1 | 1 | DY | NSAT | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| | Jackson St | Ducommun St | 1 | 1 | 2LT/DY | NSAT | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| | Ducommun St | Commercial St | 1 | 1 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | Commercial St | Ramirez St | 1 | 1 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| 1 st St | Judge John Aiso St | Central Ave | 2 | 2 | DY | NSAT | 1 HR PA 9A-6P |
| | Central Ave | Alameda St | 2 | 2 | DY | NSAT | NSAT |
| | Alameda St | Vignes St | 2 | 2 | DY | NSAT, 2HR PA 8A-4P | NSAT, 2HR PA 9A-6P |
| Temple St | Vignes St | Center St | 1 | 1 | SDY | | |
| | Judge John Aiso St | Alameda St | 2 | 2 | 2LT | 1 HR PA 8A-6P | NSAT |
| | Alameda St | Vignes St | 1 | 1 | DY/2LT | 10 HR PA 6A-4P | NSAT |
| | Vignes St | Center St | 1 | 1 | DY | 2 HR PA 8A-6P | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| Commercial St | Los Angeles St | Alameda St | 1 | 1 | | NSAT | |
| | Alameda St | Hewitt St | 1 | 1 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | Hewitt St | Garey St | 1 | 1 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | Garey St | Vignes St | 1 | 1 | 2LT | NSAT | NSAT |
| | Vignes St | Center St | 1 | 1 | DY | NSAT | NSAT |
| Hewitt St Garey St | Center St | *Street End* | 1 | 1 | DY | NSAT | PA, NSAT |
| | Ducommun St | Commercial St | 1 | 1 | DY | 10 HR PA 6A-4P | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |
| | Ducommun St | Commercial St | 1 | 1 | SDY | 10 HR PA 6A-4P | 10 HR PA 6A-4P |

Notes:

- RM – Raised Median
- DY – Double Yellow Line
- 2LT – Dual Left Turn
- SDY – Single Dashed Yellow Line
- NSAT – No Stopping Any Time

- PA – Parking Allowed
- NPA (Specific Time) – No Parking Allowed Between Specific Times
- NPAT – No Parking Allowed
- RZ – Red Zone

Source: Kaku Associates, Inc., 2003.

3-15.1.2 Existing Traffic Volumes and Operating Conditions at Study Intersections

The following sections present the existing peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections, a description of the methodology used to analyze intersection operating conditions, and the resulting level of service at each location under existing conditions.

Nine intersections in the vicinity of the proposed Alignments A and A-1 were analyzed. Their locations are illustrated on Figure 3-15.1. They are as follows:

1. Alameda Street and Commercial Street*
2. Hewitt Street and Commercial Street
3. Garey Street and Commercial Street
4. Vignes Street and Commercial Street
5. Center Street and Commercial Street
6. Alameda Street and Temple Street*
7. Vignes Street and Temple Street
8. Alameda Street and 1st Street*
9. Vignes Street and 1st Street*

* Signal – controlled intersections

a. Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes


Weekday a.m. and p.m. peak period intersection turning movement counts for the nine study intersections were conducted from 7 to 10 a.m. and from 3 to 6 p.m. on Wednesday, February 19, 2003. The existing weekday peak hour turning movements at the analyzed intersections are summarized on Figure 3-15.2.

b. Intersection Level of Service Standards and Methodology

Level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure used to describe the condition of traffic flow, ranging from excellent conditions at LOS A to overloaded conditions at LOS F. The City of Los Angeles typically uses LOS D as the threshold of impact, meaning that LOS D or better represents satisfactory conditions, while LOS E or F is considered substandard. Table 3-15.2 and Table 3-15.3 provide level of service definitions for signalized and stop-controlled intersections, respectively.


Four of the nine study intersections are currently controlled by traffic signals. The City of *Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)* requires that the “Critical Movement Analysis” (CMA) method¹ of intersection capacity analysis be used. The methodology estimates a volume to capacity ratio (V/C) for an intersection based on the turning movement volumes, lane

¹ Transportation Research Board, 1980.



Source: Kaku Associates.

Figure 3-15.1: Traffic Study Area



Source: Kaku Associates.

Figure 3-15.2: Existing (2003) AM and PM Peak Hour Volume

configuration, and other characteristics of the intersection. The correlation between V/C ratio and LOS designation is shown in Table 3-15.2. The CALCADB software package developed by LADOT was used to implement the CMA methodology in this study.

Table 3-15.2: Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections

| Level of Service | Average Control Delay per Vehicle (seconds/vehicle) | Definition |
|------------------|---|---|
| A | ≤10.0 | EXCELLENT. No vehicle waits longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used. |
| B | >10.0 and ≤20.0 | VERY GOOD. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles. |
| C | >20.0 and ≤35.0 | GOOD. Occasionally drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles. |
| D | >35.0 and ≤55.0 | FAIR. Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive backups. |
| E | >55.0 and ≤80.0 | POOR. Represents the most vehicles intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles. |
| F | >80.0 | FAILURE. Backups from nearby locations or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths. |

Source: Adapted from Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual*, 2000.

Table 3-15.3: Level of Service Definitions for Stop-Controlled Intersections

| Level of Service | Average Control Delay (seconds/vehicle) |
|------------------|---|
| A | ≤10.0 |
| B | >10.0 and ≤15.0 |
| C | >15.0 and ≤25.0 |
| D | >25.0 and ≤35.0 |
| E | >35.0 and ≤50.0 |
| F | >50.0 |

Source: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual*, 2000.

The four signalized study intersections are currently controlled by the City of Los Angeles' Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) system. In accordance with LADOT procedures, a capacity increase of 7 percent (0.07 V/C) adjustment was applied to reflect the benefits of ATSAC control at these intersections.

Five of the nine study intersections are currently unsignalized; the Hewitt Street/Commercial Street, Vignes Street/Commercial Street, Center Street/Commercial Street, and Vignes

Street/Temple Street intersections are controlled by stop signs on all four approaches. The Garey Street/Commercial Street intersection is controlled by a stop sign on the northbound approach of Garey Street. Levels of service of these unsignalized intersections were evaluated using stop-controlled methodologies from the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).

c. Existing Level of Service at Study Intersections

The level of service methodologies described above were used to determine existing operating conditions at each of the study intersections. The existing (2003) conditions weekday peak hour volumes and intersection lane configurations were key data used to define the level of service. Table 3-15.4 summarizes the existing AM and PM peak hour V/C ratios and corresponding level of service at each of the study intersections. None of the nine intersections currently operates at an LOS the City of Los Angeles considers to be unacceptable. Most intersections operate at a good to excellent level of service, (LOS C or better), during both peak hours. Only one intersection, Alameda Street/1st Street, operates at LOS D during the morning peak hour.

Table 3-15.4: Existing Intersection Level of Service

| | Intersection | Peak Hour | Existing (2003) | |
|----|---|-----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | v/c-delay | LOS |
| *1 | Alameda St & Aliso St / Commercial St | AM | 0.466 | A |
| | | PM | 0.477 | A |
| 2 | Hewitt St / SR-101 SB Ramps & Commercial St [a] | AM | 16.2 | C |
| | | PM | 13.7 | B |
| 3 | Garey St & Commercial St [b] | AM | 10.0 | B |
| | | PM | 12.0 | B |
| 4 | Vignes St / SR-101 SB Ramp & Commercial St [a] | AM | 9.1 | A |
| | | PM | 17.8 | C |
| 5 | Center St & Commercial St [a] | AM | 11.2 | B |
| | | PM | 11.8 | B |
| *6 | Alameda St & Temple St | AM | 0.509 | A |
| | | PM | 0.499 | A |
| 7 | Vignes St & Temple St [a] | AM | 9.0 | A |
| | | PM | 15.6 | C |
| *8 | Alameda St & 1 st St | AM | 0.805 | D |
| | | PM | 0.747 | C |
| *9 | Vignes St & 1 st St | AM | 0.505 | A |
| | | PM | 0.659 | B |

Notes:
 * Intersection is currently operating under ATISAC system.
 [a] Intersection is all-way stop controlled. Average intersection vehicular delay in seconds per vehicle is reported rather than V/C ratio.
 [b] Intersection is two-way stop controlled. Average vehicular delay in seconds per vehicle is reported for the worst-case approach rather than V/C ratio.

Source: Kaku Associates, Inc., 2003.

3-15.1.3 Existing Volumes and Traffic Conditions on U.S. 101 Mainline

Using data contained in 2002 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County,² existing operating conditions on U.S. 101 north of Vignes Street (postmile 0.46) were assessed.

² Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2002.

Demand to capacity (D/C) ratios were estimated assuming a capacity of 2000 vehicles per hour per lane. Table 3-15.5 explains the correlation between D/C ratios and LOS for freeway lanes.

Table 3-15.5: Level of Service Definitions for Freeway Mainline Segments

| Level of Service | Demand/Capacity Ratio |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| A | 0.00 - 0.35 |
| B | >0.35 - 0.54 |
| C | >0.54 - 0.77 |
| D | >0.77 - 0.93 |
| E | >0.93 - 1.00 |
| F(0) | >1.00 - 1.25 |
| F(1) | >1.25 - 1.35 |
| F(2) | >1.35 - 1.45 |
| F(3) | >1.45 |

Source: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 1997 *Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County*, November 1997, Exhibit D-6.

Table 3-15.6 summarizes the analysis results for existing conditions. Northbound U.S. 101 operates at LOS F (2) and C during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. Southbound U.S. 101 operates at LOS C and F (2) during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.

3-15.1.4 Existing Public Transit Service

The project study area is currently served by an extensive transit system including bus, rail, and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities. The proposed project is situated in and around Union Station/Gateway Transit Center in downtown Los Angeles, a major hub of transit activity. Numerous bus routes stop or terminate at Union Station/Gateway Transit Center, as do MTA Red Line and Gold Line, Metrolink, and Amtrak trains.

The El Monte Busway provides an express link to the Transit Center.

Table 3-15.6: Existing Freeway Mainline Level of Service

| Freeway Analysis Location | Peak | Existing Conditions | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|
| | | Capacity | | NB | | | SB | | |
| | | NB | SB | Volume | D/C | LOS* | Volume | D/C | LOS* |
| U.S.-101 north of Vignes St (postmile 0.45) | AM | 10,000 | 8,000 | 13,600 | 1.360 | F(2) | 5,228 | 0.654 | C |
| | PM | 10,000 | 8,000 | 6,561 | 0.656 | C | 10,880 | 1.360 | F(2) |

Notes:

* Note that F(0) through F(3) represent gradations of LOS F (see Table 5).

[1] Existing capacity and volume information from 2002 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County [MTA, June 2002] reflect 2001 conditions.

[2] No construction or project trips travel on the freeway. For this reason, there is no difference between Cumulative Base, Cumulative Plus Project Construction, and Cumulative Plus Project forecasts for a given forecast year.

Source: Kaku Associates, Inc., 2003.

3-15.2 Environmental Impacts

The potential project-generated traffic and parking impacts on the street and highway system in the various segments of the proposed project were analyzed to include investigation of:

- Study Intersections: Potential for project impacts during the weekday AM and PM peak hours of traffic was studied. Nine intersections in the segment 3 area of the proposed project were analyzed, as described in Section 3-15.1.2 of this document.
- U.S. 101 Mainline: Two types of impacts to the U.S. 101 mainline (Segment 2) were studied. Impacts to freeway operating conditions resulting from freeway lane closures needed for construction activities were analyzed in Segment 1. Long-term impacts generated by the addition of project construction or project traffic to the freeway mainline were investigated (see Table 3-15.7).
- Union Station Traffic Impacts: Two types of Union Station traffic impacts were studied. Effects of the proposed project on Union Station's internal circulation system were assessed. Effects of relocating Amtrak's mail and express operations from Track 13 in Union Station to the south end of the Amtrak yard near 16th Street were also investigated.
- CMP: Potential project impacts on the regional highway and transit systems, in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP), were studied.
- On-Street Parking: How the completed project would affect on-street parking availability was studied.

Table 3-15.7: Future Freeway Mainline Level of Service

| Freeway Analysis Location | Peak | Year 2010 Cumulative Base, Cumulative Plus Construction, & Cumulative Plus Project [1] | | | | | | Year 2025 Cumulative Base & Cumulative Plus Project [1] | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|-------|--------|-------|------|--------|---|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|
| | | Capacity | | NB | | SB | | Capacity | | NB | | SB | | | | | |
| | | NB | SB | Volume | D/C | LOS* | Volume | D/C | LOS* | NB | SB | Volume | D/C | LOS* | | | |
| U.S. 101 north of Vignes St. (postmile 0.45) | AM | 10,000 | 8,000 | 14,824 | 1.482 | F(3) | 5,699 | 0.712 | C | 10,000 | 8,000 | 16,864 | 1.686 | F(3) | 6,482 | 0.810 | D |
| | PM | 10,000 | 8,000 | 7,151 | 0.715 | C | 11,859 | 1.482 | F(3) | 10,000 | 8,000 | 8,136 | 0.814 | D | 13,491 | 1.686 | F(3) |

Notes:

* Note that F(0) through F(3) represent gradations of LOS F (see Table 5).

[1] No construction or project trips travel on the freeway. For this reason, there is no difference between Cumulative Base, Cumulative Plus Project Construction, and Cumulative Plus Project forecasts for a given forecast year.

Source: Kaku Associates, Inc., 2003.

3-15.2.1 Evaluation Methodology


Two future years were evaluated: 2010 (anticipated project opening year) for CEQA and 2025 (horizon year) for NEPA. The following five future traffic scenarios were defined for the analysis:

- Year 2010 Cumulative Base Conditions – This scenario represents traffic and operating conditions in the expected opening year of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project, 2010. It does not include project-generated traffic. Forecasts for this scenario add the estimated background traffic growth defined by LADOT to existing volumes.
- Year 2025 Cumulative Base Conditions – This scenario represents traffic and operating conditions in a horizon year, 15 years after the expected opening of the proposed project. It does not include project-generated traffic. Forecasts for this scenario add the estimated background traffic growth defined by LADOT to existing volumes.
- Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project Construction Conditions – This scenario is compared to the Year 2010 Cumulative Base scenario to identify potential traffic effects of project construction. Forecasts for this scenario add the estimated traffic generated by project construction to the cumulative base traffic forecasts. Any street closures or street width reductions necessary during project construction are also included in this scenario.
- Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions – This scenario is compared to the Year 2010 Cumulative Base scenario to identify potential traffic impacts of the proposed project. Forecasts for this scenario add the estimated traffic generated by project construction to the cumulative base traffic forecasts.
- Year 2025 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions – This scenario is compared to the Year 2025 Cumulative Base scenario to identify potential traffic impacts of the proposed project. Forecasts for this scenario add the estimated traffic generated by project construction to the cumulative base traffic forecasts.

Evaluation of the level of service at study intersections and on the U.S. 101 mainline was a key component of the impact analysis. The methodologies used to analyze level of service were described in Section 3-15.1 of this document within the discussion of existing conditions. Volume forecasts and roadway geometry expected under each of the five future scenarios were developed in support of the future level of service analysis. The volume forecasts are illustrated on Figure 3-15.3 through Figure 3-15.7.


Analysis of the local street system compares the projected level of service at each study intersection under cumulative base, cumulative plus construction, and cumulative plus project conditions to determine potential project impacts. The significance of these impacts is determined by criteria established by the City of Los Angeles, described in the next section.

To support analysis of the on-street parking impacts, new counts of on-street parking supply were obtained in February 2003. Places where the project alignments might encroach on parking were identified and the number of on-street parking spaces affected estimated.




Source: Kaku Associates.

Figure 3-15.3: Year 2010 Cumulative Base AM and PM Peak Hour Volume




Source: Kaku Associates.

Figure 3-15.5: Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project Construction AM and PM Peak Hour Volume



Source: Kaku Associates.

Figure 3-15.6: Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project AM and PM Peak Hour Volume



Source: Kaku Associates.

Figure 3-15.7: Year 2025 Cumulative Plus Project AM and PM Peak Hour Volume

3-15.2.2 Impact Criteria

LADOT has established threshold criteria that determine if a project has a significant traffic impact at a specific intersection. According to the LADOT criteria, a project impact after the project is operational would be considered significant if the following conditions were met:

| Intersection Condition With Project Traffic | | Project-Related Increase in V/C Ratio |
|--|---------------|--|
| LOS | V/C Ratio | |
| C | 0.701 - 0.800 | Equal to or greater than 0.040 |
| D | 0.801 - 0.900 | Equal to or greater than 0.020 |
| E, F | > 0.901 | Equal to or greater than 0.010 |

3-15.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

No differences exist between the construction period impacts of Alternatives A and A-1. The alternatives are discussed simultaneously in the sections below.

a. Study Intersections

Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project Construction traffic forecasts were analyzed to determine potential future operating conditions and traffic effects attributable to the addition of project construction traffic. The section of Table 3-15.8 entitled “Cumulative + Construction (2010)” shows the results of this analysis.

Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Construction operating conditions were compared to Year 2010 Cumulative Base operating conditions to identify potential construction effects. Three components of project construction traffic projects were studied: rerouting of traffic due to construction barriers, construction worker trips, and construction vehicles coming to and from the site.

It is assumed that no construction-related detours or street closures would occur during the peak hours. The majority of construction procedures could be accomplished without encroaching on streets because the project alignment is primarily located off-street.

It is assumed that construction workers would arrive before 7 a.m. and depart before 5 p.m., i.e. during off-peak hours. As a result, construction worker traffic would not increase traffic levels during either peak hour.

Trucks would arrive and depart the construction site throughout the workday. It is expected that a maximum of 15 trucks would cycle in and out of the site during any given day. It was assumed that at most, 10 trucks (5 inbound and 5 outbound) would arrive or depart during the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 3-15.8: Intersection Level of Service Analysis

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Cumulative Base (2010) | | Cumulative Construction (2010) | | Construction Increase in V/C [b] | Cumulative + Project (2010) | | Project Increase in V/C | Significant Project Impact | Cumulative Base (2025) | | Cumulative + Project (2025) | | Project Increase in V/C | Significant Project Impact |
|--|-----------|------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | v/c-delay | LOS | v/c-delay | LOS | | v/c-delay | LOS | | | v/c-delay | LOS | v/c-delay | LOS | | |
| *1 Alameda St & Aliso St / Commercial St | AM | 0.503 | A | 0.504 | A | 0.001 | 0.503 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.584 | A | 0.584 | A | 0.000 | NO |
| | PM | 0.515 | A | 0.516 | A | 0.001 | 0.515 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.597 | A | 0.586 | A | 0.000 | NO |
| | AM | 9.3 | A | 9.3 | A | 0.0 | 9.3 | A | 0.0 | [a] | 10.0 | B | 9.5 | A | 0.0 | [a] |
| 2 Hewitt St / SR-101 SB Ramps & Commercial St [a] | PM | 10.0 | B | 10.0 | B | 0.0 | 10.0 | B | 0.0 | [a] | 11.0 | B | 11.0 | B | 0.0 | [a] |
| | AM | 0.167 | A | 0.167 | A | 0.000 | 0.167 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.197 | A | 0.170 | A | -0.027 | NO |
| | PM | 0.225 | A | 0.225 | A | 0.000 | 0.225 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.265 | A | 0.265 | A | 0.000 | NO |
| 3 Garey St & Commercial St | AM | 0.381 | A | 0.381 | A | 0.000 | 0.381 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.464 | A | 0.397 | A | -0.067 | NO |
| | PM | 0.927 | E | 0.927 | E | 0.000 | 0.927 | E | 0.000 | NO | 1.112 | F | 1.020 | F | -0.092 | NO |
| | AM | 0.265 | A | 0.265 | A | 0.000 | 0.265 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.303 | A | 0.248 | A | -0.055 | NO |
| 4 Vignes St / SR-101 SB Ramp & Commercial St [a] | PM | 0.553 | A | 0.553 | A | 0.000 | 0.553 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.653 | B | 0.602 | B | -0.051 | NO |
| | AM | 11.7 | B | 11.7 | B | 0.0 | 11.4 | B | -0.3 | [a] | 13.2 | B | 10.5 | B | -2.7 | [a] |
| | PM | 12.4 | B | 12.4 | B | 0.0 | 12.2 | B | -0.2 | [a] | 14.2 | B | 12.6 | B | -1.6 | [a] |
| 5 Center St & Commercial St [a] | AM | 0.348 | A | 0.348 | A | 0.000 | 0.338 | A | -0.010 | NO | 0.398 | A | 0.279 | A | -0.119 | NO |
| | PM | 0.371 | A | 0.371 | A | 0.000 | 0.371 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.423 | A | 0.361 | A | -0.062 | NO |
| | AM | 0.549 | A | 0.551 | A | 0.002 | 0.549 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.636 | B | 0.609 | B | -0.027 | NO |
| *6 Alameda St & Temple St | PM | 0.539 | A | 0.541 | A | 0.002 | 0.539 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.625 | B | 0.619 | B | -0.006 | NO |
| | AM | 9.3 | A | 9.3 | A | 0.0 | 9.3 | A | 0.0 | [a] | 9.9 | A | 9.6 | A | -0.3 | [a] |
| | PM | 18.2 | C | 18.2 | C | 0.0 | 18.2 | C | 0.0 | [a] | 29.6 | D | 28.9 | D | -0.7 | [a] |
| 7 Vignes St & Temple St [a] | AM | 0.293 | A | 0.293 | A | 0.000 | 0.293 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.334 | A | 0.334 | A | 0.000 | NO |
| | PM | 0.573 | A | 0.573 | A | 0.000 | 0.573 | A | 0.000 | NO | 0.655 | B | 0.655 | B | 0.000 | NO |
| | AM | 0.867 | D | 0.868 | D | 0.001 | 0.867 | D | 0.000 | NO | 0.997 | E | 0.940 | E | -0.057 | NO |
| *8 Alameda St & 1 st St | PM | 0.804 | D | 0.806 | D | 0.002 | 0.804 | D | 0.000 | NO | 0.805 | D | 0.750 | C | -0.055 | NO |
| | AM | 0.545 | A | 0.545 | A | 0.000 | 0.545 | A | 0.000 | NO | 1.061 | F | 0.943 | E | -0.073 | NO |
| | PM | 0.711 | C | 0.711 | C | 0.000 | 0.711 | C | 0.000 | NO | 1.256 | F | 1.190 | F | -0.066 | NO |

Notes:

* Intersection is currently operating under ATSC system.

[a] Intersection is all-way stop controlled. The top rows show analysis using Highway Capacity Manual stop-controlled methodology, for the purpose of evaluating the operating condition of the intersection. Average intersection vehicular delay in seconds per vehicle is reported rather than V/C ratio. The bottom rows show analysis using the CMA methodology, for the purpose of application of City of Los Angeles significance criteria. V/C ratio is reported.

[b] LADOT considers construction effects to be temporary.

Source: Kaku Associates, Inc., 2003.

The comparison between Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Construction operating conditions and Year 2010 Cumulative Base operating conditions found that construction traffic would have a minimal effect on study intersections.

b. U.S. 101 Mainline

Two types of impacts to the U.S. 101 mainline were studied: impacts generated by the addition of project construction or project traffic to the freeway mainline, and impacts to freeway operating conditions resulting from freeway lane closures needed for construction activities.

Future operating conditions on the U.S. 101 mainline north of Vignes Street are summarized in Table 3-15.7. Currently, five northbound and four southbound lanes are in operation at this location. The same conditions would be present in 2010 and 2025. Years 2010 and 2025 traffic projections for the U.S. 101 mainline were developed using a methodology similar to the one used for the study intersections.

Cumulative base forecasts for U.S. 101 were developed by adding background traffic growth 2001 volumes obtained from the 2002 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County. An annual growth of 1 percent per year was conservatively assumed in the development of 2010 and 2025 forecasts. Traffic volumes from 2001 were adjusted upward by 9 percent to reflect background growth occurring from 2001 to 2010. A total growth rate of 24 percent reflected background growth from 2001 to 2025 for the freeway.

Since most of construction and project traffic would travel on the local streets, which provide access to the construction areas, construction traffic is not expected to use the U.S. 101 during the morning and afternoon peak hours, resulting in no D/C increase. Because of the very low level of construction trips, construction would not affect U.S. 101 operating conditions during the peak hours.

Both Alternatives A and A-1 involve bridging over U.S. 101. Improvements to U.S. 101 as part of the Department widening project would provide a center median of sufficient width (approximately 30 feet [9.1 meters]) to accommodate the run-through bridge support piers. The median is expected to be complete before the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project begins construction. Run-through construction activities would primarily involve the shoulders and median of U.S. 101. Construction of the supports would not require closure of freeway lanes. Some short-term lane closures may be required to move equipment in and out of the median and to install the bridge spans across the freeway. These closures would occur during off-peak hours. Therefore, potential impacts associated with construction over U.S. 101 are expected to be minimal.

3-15.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

Little difference exists between the long-term impacts of Alternatives A and A-1. The alternatives are discussed simultaneously in the sections below.

a. Union Station Traffic Impacts (Segment 1 Area)

Catellus Corporation's development plans for Union Station involve modifications to its internal vehicle circulation system including Arcadia (South Baggage Road), Garcia, and New Avila Streets, all of which are on the north side of U.S. 101. In addition, the Run-Through Tracks Project includes modification to the South Baggage Road. Impacts of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project on the future circulation system were studied. The proposed project would interact with Union Station's circulation system at one primary location, where it crosses over Arcadia Street (South Baggage Road). The proposed project is being coordinated with Catellus Corporation to ensure that sufficient vertical clearance would be provided between the run-through bridge and the newly depressed South Baggage Road.

b. U.S. 101 Mainline (Segment 2 Area)

Future operating conditions on the U.S. 101 mainline north of Vignes Street are summarized in Table 3-15.7. Since the proposed project would result in a net reduction of vehicle trips, there would be no D/C increase attributable to the Run-Through Tracks Project. Traffic generated by the proposed project would not have an impact on U.S. 101 operating conditions during the peak hours.

c. Study Intersections (Segment 3 Area)

Year 2010 and 2025 Cumulative Plus Project traffic forecasts were analyzed to determine potential future operating conditions and traffic impacts with the addition of project-generated traffic. Table 3-15.8 shows the results of this analysis.

Two comparisons were made in order to isolate the impacts of the proposed project:

- Year 2010 Cumulative Plus Project operating conditions were compared to Year 2010 Cumulative Base operating conditions to identify opening year impacts for CEQA.
- Year 2025 Cumulative Plus Project operating conditions were compared to Year 2025 Cumulative Base operating conditions to identify long-term impacts for NEPA.

As shown in table 3-15.8, it was found that project-generated traffic would have a minimal effect on the traffic study area intersections and that no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would result.

d. Impacts of Relocating Amtrak's Mail and Express Operations (Segment 4 Area)

Track 13 at Union Station currently supports Amtrak's mail and express operations. As part of the proposed project these operations would be moved to the Amtrak yard located on 16th Street.

The existing facility on Track 13 has spots for nine railroad cars. It is operable 24 hours per day, seven days a week. Typically, 7 mail and 9 to 13 express railcars per day either load or unload at the facility. Each railcar generates about three truckloads.

The inbound railcar loads arrive at Union Station in the morning. The unloading operation moves the cargo from the railcars to the trucks. The mail trucks come directly to the site from several postal locations, and the express trucks come from the Amtrak yard located on 16th Street. Trucks traveling from the Amtrak yard to Union Station travel up Santa Fe Avenue to Vignes Street, then around to Bauchet and into the Track 13 site. Empty truck trailers are driven to Union Station between 6 and 8 a.m. and dropped off. Truck tractors leave Union Station and return after about 11 a.m. to pick up loaded truck trailers.

The outbound railcars depart Union Station in the afternoon. Loaded truck trailers are driven to Union Station between 4 to 5 p.m. and dropped off. Their cargo is loaded into railcars that are released for movement around 6:20 p.m. Truck tractors leave Union Station during the unloading/loading process and return to collect the emptied truck trailers between 6 and 8 p.m.

When Amtrak's mail and express operations are relocated from Union Station to Amtrak's Redondo Junction yard, the trucks serving the mail railcars would travel to the Amtrak yard instead of Union Station. Of the seven daily mail railcars, four are inbound and three are outbound. Given that three trucks are needed per railcar, this translates into 12 trucks and 9 truck roundtrips in the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. Since the trucks serving the mail railcars arrive from several postal locations, it was approximated that no more than 25 percent would arrive from each direction. In other words, no more than two to three trucks would arrive from each direction. This would have a negligible effect on the volumes at intersections in the vicinity of the relocated facility.

When Amtrak's mail and express operations are relocated, the trucks serving the express railcars at Union Station would no longer be needed. Since the trucks serving the express railcars all travel along the same route between Union Station and the Amtrak yard, as described above, their elimination was reflected in the traffic volumes as follows. Currently, nine to 13 express railcars are loaded or unloaded per day. Since the net effect is to remove trips from the network, nine railcars were conservatively assumed. It was further assumed that five of the nine railcars would arrive in the morning and four would depart in the afternoon. Given that each railcar carries three truckloads, this translates into 15 and 12 truck roundtrips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. The net traffic effect of this move would be a reduced number of truck trips on the route from Amtrak yard to Union Station via Santa Fe Avenue to Vignes Street, then around to Bauchet. As a result, truck trips would also be reduced at the studied intersection of Commercial Street and Center Street.

Traffic associated with the relocation was included in the Year 2010 and 2025 Cumulative Plus Project traffic projections at the study intersections. Future operating conditions at the study intersections were analyzed based on these projections as described earlier. The analysis found that the project would not cause any adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts at study intersections.

e. Vehicle Traffic Resulting from Increased Ridership

The proposed project is expected to have a positive effect on transportation and circulation by increasing the efficiency of transportation services at Union Station. The increased rail ridership supported by the project is not expected to generate additional vehicle traffic in the vicinity of Union Station during either peak hour. The traffic associated with increased rail ridership would

enter the traffic network in the suburbs, not near Unions Station. Transit riders arriving at Union Station would be most likely to transfer to other transit modes (e.g., Red Line, Gold Line, and LA DASH). Although taxi service that uses local streets is available at Union Station, the volume of such service is not, and would not be, sufficient to reduce LOS on the streets serving Los Angeles Union Station.

The projected number of Metrolink commuter trains to be added is approximately 182 by 2010 and 235 by 2025. With the current Union Station configuration, 182 trains can be accommodated up to year 2010 without the proposed project. With the implementation of the Run-Through Tracks Project, Union Station is expected to accommodate an additional 53 trains by 2025.

Based on SCRRA's estimated ridership of 258 passengers per train, an additional 13,674 passengers would be served per day by the project between 2010 and 2025. It is expected that without the proposed project, these 13,674 passengers would have to commute into and out of Los Angeles via other modes. To understand the effects of the added ridership on the street system in the vicinity of Union Station, the number of transit passengers should be translated to vehicles. To do this, a modal split percentage was used.

Modal split, based on the 2001 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County, states that transit trips have a 9.9 percent share of the overall travel modes, while carpool trips occupied 17.2 percent and drive-alone trips use 72.9 percent. Using this method, approximately 1,354 out of 13,674 added transit passengers would be bus passengers, approximately 2,353 carpool passengers, and approximately 9,968 single-occupant drivers. Assuming 30 passengers per vehicle for buses, two passengers per vehicle for carpool, and one passenger per vehicle for single-driver vehicles, the number of vehicles removed daily from the roadway network in the vicinity of Union Station is approximately 11,189.

With Metrolink commuter services originating from the north, south and east, it was assumed that added transit riders would arrive in Los Angeles from the same directions. Assuming that the peak hour generates 10 percent of daily traffic, 1,119 vehicle trips would be removed from the roadway network from the three directions previously stated, resulting in vehicle trip reductions at studied intersections in both peak hours.

f. Congestion Management Program

This section presents the Congestion Management Program (CMP) transportation impact analysis for the proposed project. This analysis was conducted in accordance with the transportation impact analysis (TIA) procedures outlined in the 2002 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County (MTA 2002). The CMP requires that, when an environmental impact report is prepared for a project, traffic and transit impact analyses be conducted for select regional facilities based on the quantity of project traffic expected to use these facilities.

CMP Traffic Impact Analysis

The CMP monitoring locations closest to the proposed project location are the Alameda Street/Washington Boulevard intersection (a CMP arterial monitoring intersection near the relocated Amtrak facility in Segment 4), the Alvarado Street/Sunset Boulevard intersection (a CMP arterial monitoring intersection), the Wilshire Boulevard/Alvarado Street intersection (a

CMP arterial monitoring intersection), and U.S. 101 north of Vignes Street (a CMP freeway monitoring location in Segment 2).

The CMP guidelines for determining the study area of the analysis for CMP arterial monitoring intersections and for freeway monitoring locations are:

- All CMP arterial monitoring intersections where the proposed project is expected to add 50 or more vehicles per hour (vph) during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours of adjacent street traffic.
- All CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations where the proposed project is expected to add 150 or more vph in either direction during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours.

The proposed project is not expected to add sufficient new traffic to exceed the arterial intersection analysis criteria or the freeway analysis criteria at the nearest monitoring locations or at any location. Since project traffic during either peak hour is projected to be less than the minimum criterion of 50 vph for arterial intersections and 150 vph for freeway locations, no further analysis of CMP arterial monitoring intersections or freeway monitoring locations is required.

CMP Transit Impact Analysis

Project impacts on public transit services would be considered significant if the project resulted in a substantial increase in ridership on the existing public transit system, creating capacity shortages on the system and thereby necessitating system improvements to accommodate additional transit service.

The proposed project is intended to improve operational efficiencies and reliability of schedules for existing trains utilizing Union Station, as well as accommodating the planned expansion of Amtrak and Metrolink services. The proposed project would not create capacity shortages and thus would not create a significant CMP transit impact.

g. On-Street Parking

An analysis of the potential impacts of the two alignment alternatives to on-street parking in the traffic study area was conducted. Counts of on-street parking supply were obtained in February 2003. Places where the project alignments might encroach on parking were identified and the number of on-street parking spaces affected estimated. Table 3-15.9 summarizes the number of spaces available on Commercial, Vignes, Garey, Center, Alameda, Hewitt, and Ducommun Streets. There were a total of 183 general spaces and seven loading spaces identified. Most of the parking in the area was metered. The meters and a 10-hour parking limit were effective weekdays between 6 a.m. and 4 p.m.

Table 3-15.9: Existing On-Street Parking

| Location | Number of Spaces (by type) | |
|--|----------------------------|---------|
| | General | Loading |
| Commercial Street (between Alameda St and end east of Center St) | 0 | 3 |
| Vignes Street (between Commercial St and Jackson St) | 27 | 0 |
| Garey Street (between Commercial St and Jackson St) | 36 | 1 |
| Center Street (between U.S.-101 and Jackson St) | 9 | 0 |
| Alameda Street (between U.S.-101 and Temple St) | 0 | 0 |
| Hewitt Street (between Commercial St and Ducommun St) | 14 | 0 |
| Ducommun Street (between Alameda St and end east of Center St) | 97 | 3 |
| Total | 183 | 7 |

Source: Kaku Associates, Inc., 2003.

While Alternative A would not encroach into any roadways, Alternative A-1 does so in one location. Bent 17 of Alternative A-1 is located on the eastern edge of the Center Street median, just north of Commercial Street. Curb parking is currently present at this location and three spaces would be lost if Bent 17 of Alternative A-1 is not relocated.

3-15.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative traffic impacts could occur if construction of the various transportation projects in the study area (especially in Segments 2 and 3) were to overlap. The first project to begin construction will be the MTA Eastside LRT project, which will begin in late 2003. Some potential exists for construction of elements of the project in the vicinity of U.S. 101. However, it is the Department project that will include creation of the median in U.S. 101 that will accommodate the bridge support for the LRT bridge over the freeway. The potential cumulative impact arises from the length of time during which construction activities of the two projects could affect traffic along Alameda Street or streets leading to and from U.S. 101 ramps.

Similarly, 1st Street could have cumulative traffic impacts stemming from the duration of construction of the 1st Street Bridge widening (beginning in 2004), followed by construction of the LRT line and station, and possibly construction of the new police headquarters at 1st and Alameda Streets.

Construction of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would not likely begin until after the elements of the Eastside LRT project along Ducommun Street have been completed, thereby reducing the likelihood of cumulative impacts where these two projects overlap geographically.

The potential for cumulative construction-period impacts in the study area would be reduced by implementation of each of the projects under the auspices of a Traffic Management Program (TMP). Each project would have a TMP to organize how detours, lane closures, construction routes, etc., would occur during that project’s construction phase. LADOT would participate in developing and approving each plan, and be responsible for overall consideration of the individual plans.

3-15.3 Potential Mitigation

The traffic impact analysis determined that neither project construction nor operation of the project would result in adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts. For this reason, no mitigation measures are required. Although no mitigation measures are required, implementation of the proposed project would include development of a TMP. The TMP, created in consultation with the Department, the LADOT, and the CHP Central Los Angeles Area Office, would prescribe how any lane closures, detours, sidewalk closures, and property access changes would be handled. The TMP would also include requirements for advance public notifications of traffic changes and for providing a means of contact for problems or questions.

3-14 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

3-14.1 Existing Conditions

A population, housing, and employment study area has been defined to include the area generally bounded by Los Angeles Union Station on the north, the Los Angeles River on the east, 1st Street on the south, and Alameda Street on the west. The study area includes Census Tracts 2060.20 and 2060.30 from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing (2000 Census).

The study area boundary has been defined to encompass an area where reasonably foreseeable project effects on population, housing, and employment could occur. Additional factors considered are: census tract boundaries, geography, local planning areas, neighborhood areas, and artificial boundaries such as roads, buildings, and city blocks. It should be noted that Census Tracts 2060.20 and 2060.30 cover not only the study area, but also a large area on the east side of the Los Angeles River that would not be affected by the proposed project. Figure 3-14.1 illustrates the location of the study area in relation to the proposed project.


Data sources include, but are not limited to, the 2000 Census, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) draft population projections, the United States Postal Service residential mailing listing for the project study area, aerial photography, County of Los Angeles Assessor parcel data, and consultation with the applicable City of Los Angeles planning staff and elected officials. A windshield survey was also conducted to supplement the existing data sources. In addition, consultation with the community through public meetings and the project website has been ongoing.

3-14.1.1 Existing Population Characteristics

a. County of Los Angeles

Total population for the County of Los Angeles in 2000 was 9,519,338 persons. The nonwhite population (including persons of Hispanic origin) was 68.9% of the total population. The largest nonwhite group was persons of Hispanic origin, at 44.6% (see Table 3-14.1).

Data for other population groups have also been reviewed. These groups are: children under 18 years old, seniors age 65 and older, and persons below the federal poverty threshold. The percentage of the county population under 18 years old in 2000 was 28%, while the percentage of the population age 65 and older was 9.7%. The percentage of people below the poverty threshold was 17.9%, and per capita income was \$20,683 (see Table 3-14.2).



Source: ©2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-14.1: Population, Housing, and Employment Study Area

Table 3-14.1: Existing Regional and Local Population Characteristics—Race/Ethnicity (2000)

| Area | Total Population | White | % | Black | % | Native American | % | Asian | % | Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander | % | Other Race | % | Two or More Races | % | Hispanic or Latino | % |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|
| County of Los Angeles | 9,519,338 | 2,959,614 | 31.1 | 901,472 | 9.5 | 25,609 | 0.3 | 1,124,569 | 11.8 | 23,265 | 0.2 | 19,935 | 0.2 | 222,661 | 2.3 | 4,242,213 | 44.6 |
| City of Los Angeles | 3,694,820 | 1,099,188 | 29.7 | 401,986 | 10.9 | 8,897 | 0.2 | 364,850 | 9.9 | 4,484 | 0.2 | 9,065 | 0.2 | 87,277 | 2.4 | 1,719,073 | 46.5 |
| Study Area | 11,807 | 2,160 | 18.3 | 4,128 | 35.0 | 14 | 0.1 | 406 | 3.4 | 7 | 0.1 | 14 | 0.1 | 35 | 0.3 | 5,043 | 42.7 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 10,852 | 2,108 | 19.4 | 4,069 | 37.5 | 11 | 0.1 | 391 | 3.6 | 7 | 0.1 | 11 | 0.1 | 30 | 0.3 | 4,225 | 38.9 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 955 | 52 | 5.4 | 11 | 6.2 | 3 | 0.3 | 15 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 5 | 0.5 | 818 | 85.7 |

Source: U.S. Census SF 1 (2000) and Myra L. Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

Table 3-14.2: Existing Regional and Local Population Characteristics—Age/Income (2000)

| Area | Total Population | Age | | | Income/Poverty | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------|------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | Under 18 | % | 65 and Older | % | Per Capita Income | Below Poverty Threshold | % |
| County of Los Angeles | 9,519,338 | 2,667,976 | 28.0 | 926,673 | 9.7 | \$20,683 | 1,674,599 | 17.9 |
| City of Los Angeles | 3,694,820 | 981,311 | 26.6 | 357,129 | 9.7 | \$20,671 | 801,050 | 22.1 |
| Study Area | 11,087 | 314 | 2.7 | 43 | 0.4 | \$15,118 | 309 | 32.9 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 10,852 | 37 | 0.3 | 5 | 0.1 | \$20,841 | 11 | 23.4 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 955 | 277 | 29.0 | 38 | 4.0 | \$9,394 | 298 | 33.4 |

Source: U.S. Census SF 1 and SF 3 (2000) and Myra L. Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

b. City of Los Angeles

Total population for the City of Los Angeles in 2000 was 3,694,820 persons. The nonwhite population (including persons of Hispanic origin) was 70.3% of the total. The largest nonwhite group was persons of Hispanic origin, at 46.5% (see Table 3-14.1).

The percentage of the population under 18 years old in the city in 2000 was 26.6%, while the percentage of the population age 65 and older was 9.7%. The percentage of people below the poverty threshold was 22.1%, and per capita income was \$20,671 (see Table 3-14.2).

c. Study Area

Population in the study area in 2000 totaled 11,807 persons. Of the total, the nonwhite population (including persons of Hispanic origin) was 81.7%. The largest nonwhite group was persons of Hispanic origin, at 42.7%, which was approximately the same percentage as in the city and county (see Table 3-14.1).

The percentage of the population under 18 years in the study area in 2000 was 2.7%, while the percentage of the population age 65 years and older was 0.4%. These percentages are substantially lower than in the city and county. The percentage of people below the poverty threshold was 32.9%, somewhat higher than in the city and county. Per capita income for the study area was \$15,118, below the city and county. (See Table 3-14.2.)

3-14.1.2 Existing Housing Characteristics

a. County of Los Angeles

There were a total of 3,270,909 housing units in the County of Los Angeles in 2000. Of the total, 56.1% of all housing units were single-family units, and 42.2% were multi-family housing units. The remaining 1.7% of housing units were designated “other” (i.e., mobile homes, trailers, and houseboats). (See Table 3-14.3.)

Occupied housing units in the county in 2000 composed 95.8% of available housing, with 4.2% of all units vacant. There were about three persons per household throughout the county. Owner-occupied housing units totaled 47.9%. The remaining 52.1% were renter-occupied. (See Tables 3-14.4 and 3-14.5.)

**Table 3-14.3: Existing Regional and Local Housing Characteristics—
Size (2000)**

| Area | Total Housing Units | Single Family Dwelling Units | % | Multi Family Dwelling Units | % | Other | % |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| County of Los Angeles | 3,270,909 | 1,835,087 | 56.1 | 1,379,201 | 42.2 | 56,621 | 1.7 |
| City of Los Angeles | 1,337,668 | 612,563 | 45.8 | 716,023 | 53.5 | 9,082 | 0.7 |
| Study Area | 334 | 66 | 19.8 | 268 | 80.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 15 | 15 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 319 | 51 | 16.0 | 268 | 84.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: U.S. Census SF 3 (2000) and Myra L. Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

**Table 3-14.4: Existing Regional and Local Housing Characteristics—
Occupancy (2000)**

| Area | Total Units | Occupied Units | % | Vacant Units | % | Persons Per Household |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| County of Los Angeles | 3,270,909 | 3,133,774 | 95.8 | 137,135 | 4.2 | 3.0 |
| City of Los Angeles | 1,337,706 | 1,275,412 | 95.3 | 62,294 | 4.7 | 2.9 |
| Study Area | 334 | 276 | 82.6 | 58 | 17.4 | 3.6 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 19 | 14 | 73.7 | 5 | 26.3 | 0.0 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 315 | 262 | 83.2 | 53 | 17 | 3.6 |

Source: U.S. Census SF 1 (2000) and Myra L. Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

**Table 3-14.5: Existing Regional and Local Housing Characteristics—
Tenure (2000)**

| Area | Occupied Units | Owner Occupied Units | % | Renter Occupied Units | % |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| County of Los Angeles | 3,133,774 | 1,499,744 | 47.9 | 1,634,030 | 52.1 |
| City of Los Angeles | 1,275,412 | 491,882 | 38.6 | 783,530 | 61.4 |
| Study Area | 276 | 18 | 6.5 | 258 | 93.5 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 14 | 3 | 21.4 | 11 | 78.6 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 262 | 15 | 5.7 | 247 | 94.3 |

Source: U.S. Census SF 1 (2000) and Myra L. Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

b. City of Los Angeles

There were a total of 1,337,668 housing units in the City of Los Angeles in 2000. Multi-family housing units composed 53.5% of the total, while 45.8% were single-family housing units. (See Table 3-14.3.)

Occupied housing units in the City of Los Angeles in 2000 were 95.3% of all housing, with 4.7% vacant. There was an average of 2.9 persons per household throughout the city. Owner-occupied housing units totaled 38.6%. The remaining 61.4% were renter-occupied. (See Tables 3-14.4 and 3-14.5.)

c. Study Area


Housing in the study area consists of group quarters correctional facilities (i.e., Twin Towers, Men’s Central Jail, and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Detention Center) and a few live-work lofts. It is also possible that other isolated units may exist, but could not be identified from existing data sources and field surveys. More typical single- and multi-family residences are located outside the study area on the east side of the Los Angeles River. In addition, the William Meade Homes public housing complex is located outside the northern boundary of the study area, north of Alhambra Avenue (see Figure 3-14.2).

According to data from the 2000 Census, there were 334 housing units in the study area. Based on field observations, nearly all of these housing units appear to be located on the east side of the Los Angeles River, outside the project study area.

The vast majority of persons residing in the study area are inmates at the three correctional facilities near Union Station. Of the 11,807 total residents in the study area in 2000, there were 10,809 incarcerated persons. This represents 91.5% of all study area residents (see Table 3-14.6).

| Table 3-14.6: Group Quarters Characteristics (2000) | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Area | Total Persons in Group Quarters | Institutionalized Persons | % | Non-Institutionalized Persons | % |
| County of Los Angeles | 175,252 | 77,712 | 44.3 | 97,540 | 55.7 |
| City of Los Angeles | 82,597 | 30,446 | 36.9 | 52,151 | 63.1 |
| Study Area | 10,889 | 10,809 | 99.3 | 80 | 0.1 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 10,823 | 10,809 | 99.9 | 14 | 0.1 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 100.0 |

Source: U.S. Census SF 1 (2000) and Myra L. Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.



Source: ©2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-14.2: Locations of Known Residential Units

3-14.1.3 Projected Population and Households

Draft projections of local and regional population, households, and employment have been provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Official projections are not expected until April 2004.

a. Projected Population

The county, city, and study area are all projected to experience population growth during the 30 years between 2000 and 2030. Specifically, the county will increase in population by 22.2%. The city will increase in population by 13.5%. The study area will increase in population by 22.2 % (see Table 3-14.7).

| Table 3-14.7: Draft Population Projections (2015 and 2030) | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Area | 2000 | 2015 | % Change 2000–2015 | 2030 | % Change 2000–2030 |
| County of Los Angeles | 9,580,117 | 10,746,013 | 12.2 | 11,705,536 | 22.2 |
| City of Los Angeles | 3,711,996 | 4,037,554 | 8.8 | 4,212,254 | 13.5 |
| Study Area | 11,823 | 13,533 | 14.5 | 14,454 | 22.2 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 10,864 | 12,298 | 13.2 | 13,071 | 20.3 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 959 | 1,235 | 28.8 | 1,383 | 30.7 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, Draft Projections (2003) and Myra L Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

b. Projected Households

The county, city, and study area are also projected to see growth in the number of households between 2000 and 2030. The number of households in the county will increase by 31.6%. The city will see an increase in households of 25.6%. In the study area, where there are currently very few households, the increase is expected to be dramatic at 137.3% (see Table 3-14.8).

3-14.1.4 Business and Employment Characteristics

The proposed project would be located near the downtown business, financial, and transportation centers for the southern California regional economy. Businesses in the study area are primarily devoted to industrial and warehouse/distribution uses, with some scattered commercial uses as well. Several public agency offices are also located in the study area, including MTA headquarters, the Metropolitan Water District headquarters, and the City of Los Angeles Personnel Department.

Table 3-14.8: Draft Household Projections (2015 and 2030)

| Area | 2000 | 2015 | % Change 2000–2015 | 2030 | % Change 2000–2030 |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| County of Los Angeles | 3,137,109 | 3,651,901 | 16.4 | 4,128,417 | 31.6 |
| City of Los Angeles | 1,276,619 | 1,448,195 | 13.4 | 1,602,978 | 25.6 |
| Study area | 276 | 473 | 71.4 | 655 | 137.3 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 14 | 107 | 664.3 | 193 | 1,278.6 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 262 | 366 | 39.7 | 462 | 76.3 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, Draft Projections (2003) and Myra L Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

The draft employment projections prepared by SCAG indicate that the county, city, and study area are all projected to have rates of employment growth consistent with population growth between 2000 and 2030 (see Table 3-14.9).

Table 3-14.9: Draft Employment Projections (2015 and 2030)

| Area | 2000 | 2015 | % Change 2000-2015 | 2030 | % Change 2000-2030 |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| County of Los Angeles | 4,476,306 | 5,259,247 | 14.9 | 5,610,781 | 18.6 |
| City of Los Angeles | 1,781,855 | 2,158,616 | 14.0 | 2,198,161 | 17.5 |
| Study Area | 4,637 | 5,339 | 13.1 | 5,669 | 16.7 |
| Census Tract 2060.20 | 2,570 | 3,074 | 16.4 | 3,304 | 20.5 |
| Census Tract 2060.30 | 2,067 | 2,265 | 8.7 | 2,365 | 11.4 |

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, Draft Projections (2003) and Myra L Frank & Associates/Jones & Stokes 2003.

3-14.2 Environmental Impacts

The effects, if any, of construction and operation of the proposed project, are described below.

3-14.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Impact criteria were established through consideration of CEQA and NEPA guidelines and standard professional practice. The proposed project was then evaluated with respect to the impact criteria to determine what the level of impact on population, housing, and employment conditions, if any, would result.

3-14.2.2 Impact Criteria

The proposed project would result in an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact if:

- It would displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing

- It would displace substantial numbers of existing businesses or employees, necessitating the construction of replacement businesses
- It would substantially impair access to, from, or within a neighborhood, or create a barrier within a neighborhood
- It would induce substantial unplanned population growth, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- It would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income population groups.

3-14.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

Although the proposed project would not be built, the No-Build Alternative would include major new physical improvements in the study area: the U.S. 101 widening, Commercial Street widening, and Eastside LRT Extension. Each of these would be built primarily on existing rights-of-way or on vacant property. The changes to the physical environment that would occur under this alternative are focused along U.S. 101, Commercial Street, and 1st Street. However, the combination of projects included in the No-Build Alternative should have little to no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts on the study area population, housing, and employment.

b. Alternative A

Housing Displacement

Alternative A would require no residential displacements. Thus, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact would result.

Business Displacement

Alternative A would require that one warehouse, one surface pay parking lot, and a portion of an automobile impound lot be acquired. The business operations at the warehouse and parking lot would be displaced. See Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements. Because the number of acquisitions would be so small, and government relocation assistance would be offered to eligible displacees, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact would result.

c. Alternative A-1

Housing Displacement

Alternative A-1 would require no residential displacements. Thus, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact would result.

Business Displacement

Alternative A-1 would require acquisition of two occupied business locations: 801 Commercial Street and the automobile impound lot at 500 Center Street. Acquisition of these two business locations would be governed by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), as amended. The Uniform Act requires purchase at fair market value as established by appraisal and provides relocation assistance for affected businesses.

The building at 801 Commercial Street would need to be demolished to provide right-of-way for the trestle segment of Alternative A-1. The property at 500 Center Street contains only a portable building used for an automobile impound operation. After construction of the proposed project, the automobile impound operation could conceivably re-open on this site.

In addition, this business could potentially utilize other impound lots it owns in the area to replace impound areas that are acquired. See Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements. Because only two business acquisitions would be necessary, and government relocation assistance, under the Uniform Act, would be offered to eligible displacees, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact would result.

3-14.2.4 Long-Term/Operational Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would not provide capacity for long-term growth of train service at Union Station. Forecasts indicate that train traffic would effectively be at capacity in 2010, so the long-term availability of intercity, intraregional, and commuter rail passenger service to the study area could be constrained to the 2010 levels.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Access Disruption and Neighborhood Barriers

Under either Alternative A or A-1 the proposed project would not permanently impair access to and from, or within, any neighborhood. As noted above, the study area contains only a few isolated residences. More typical residential neighborhoods are located to the east, across the Los Angeles River, and to the north at the William Mead Homes public housing complex, with access points to those areas too distant from the project to be adversely affected. Furthermore, to the extent that the industrial and commercial area south of U.S. 101 can be characterized as a neighborhood, no permanent access disruption or barriers would result from the proposed project. The run-through tracks would be on an elevated trestle in this area, permitting vehicular and pedestrian access to remain essentially the same as at present.

Unplanned Growth

The proposed project, whether under Alternative A or A-1, would not result in an unplanned rate or amount of growth. As described more fully in Chapter 1 of this document, the project would

accommodate planned growth in Amtrak and Metrolink rail passenger activity. As part of Amtrak's 20-year improvement program for California, the project would be consistent with the California State Rail Plan. In addition, the proposed project would support the present working estimates of expected growth in Metrolink service over the next 25 years. Given this consistency with regional rail planning efforts, it would be very unlikely that the proposed project would directly result in unplanned growth. Growth within the study area is governed by the City of Los Angeles planning and zoning process. The proposed project does not include any elements that would conflict with city policies or plans affecting the city's ability to manage growth.

The potential indirect effects of the proposed project on growth would also be negligible. No new or expanded infrastructure, housing, or other similar permanent physical changes to the environment would be necessary as an indirect consequence of the proposed project. No indirect demand for new housing or infrastructure would occur because the project would require no residential displacements. Furthermore, since the project would be consistent with regional rail planning efforts, it would be reasonable to conclude that the project would not indirectly induce growth in population, households, or employment that is not already accounted for in the draft SCAG projections.

Environmental Justice (NEPA-only Consideration)

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations, signed on February 11, 1994, directs federal agencies to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of federal projects and programs on minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. The term "minority" includes persons who identify themselves as Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, or of Hispanic origin. The term "low income" includes persons whose household income is at or below the federal poverty level.

The determination of whether or not the effects of the proposed project would be disproportionately high and adverse depends on whether 1) the effects of the project are predominately borne by a minority or low-income population or 2) the effects of the project are appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude to minority or low-income populations compared to the effects on non-minority or non-low-income populations. See FHWA Western Resource Center Interim Guidance—Addressing Environmental Justice in the EA/EIS (1999).

The population data presented above in the description of existing conditions indicate that the census tracts encompassing the study area contain substantial concentrations of two minority population groups (i.e., Black [35%] and Hispanic Origin [42.7%]), and a large proportion of persons with incomes below the federal poverty threshold. However, based on field observations and the analysis of data about incarcerated persons in this area, it appears that these minority and low-income populations are almost entirely concentrated in the three correctional facilities, where 91.5% of the total population in these two census tracts are housed. The vast majority of the remaining population residing in Tracts 2060.20 and 2060.30 are located outside the study area, across the Los Angeles River. Accordingly, with so few non-incarcerated persons known to reside within the project study area itself, it is very unlikely that the proposed project would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on any population group, regardless of race,

ethnicity, or economic status. The impact analyses conducted for specific environmental topics (which are reported in other sections of Chapter 3) do not reveal the occurrence of adverse impacts (under NEPA) to any population group in the study area.

3-14.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Taking into consideration the incremental effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development projects and transportation improvements in the project area (See Chapter 2 and Appendix G), it would be very unlikely that the proposed project would result in any cumulatively considerable effects on population, housing, and employment. There would be no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts with regard to these issues.

3-14.2.6 Mitigation Measures

Because there would be no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts, no mitigation measures are required.

3-13 SAFETY AND SECURITY

3-13.1 Existing Conditions

Safety and security of railroad facilities falls under the jurisdiction of various federal, state, and local agencies, including the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). These agencies are primarily concerned with the overall safety of railroad facilities and operations. Local agencies such as the police/sheriff departments and transportation agency security forces are primarily concerned with passenger security and the security of the facilities from possible vandalism or destruction.

Safety is of great concern to passengers and railroad operators. All modes of transit have an inherent level of risk, despite the extensive efforts to make that particular means of travel as safe as possible.

3-13.1.1 National Transportation Safety Board

NTSB is an independent federal agency charged by Congress with investigating every civil aviation accident in the United States and significant railroad, highway, marine, and pipeline accidents. NTSB determines the probable cause of railroad accidents involving passenger trains or any train accident that results in at least one fatality or major property damage. Based on its investigations, the board issues safety recommendations aimed at preventing future accidents.

3-13.1.2 Federal Railroad Administration

FRA was created pursuant to Section 3(e)(1) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 U.S.C. 103). The purpose of FRA is to promulgate and enforce rail safety regulations, administer railroad assistance programs, conduct research and development in support of improved railroad, and consolidate government support of rail transportation activities.

The FRA exercises jurisdiction over all areas of rail safety under the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, as amended, and related railroad safety statutes addressing track maintenance, inspection standards, equipment standards, and operating practices. FRA's Office of Safety employs more than 415 federal safety inspectors who operate out of eight regional offices nationally. Inspectors conduct site-specific safety inspections of railroads and monitor compliance with federally mandated safety standards.

FRA has also enacted regulations for the improved safety of passenger rail equipment and emergency preparedness. Passenger Equipment Safety Standards, as outlined under Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR Part 238), would be followed to maintain established railcar/engine safety measures. For the proposed project, Amtrak would also be required by FRA to develop a local emergency preparedness plan that would include the new run-through tracks, including a special circumstances section for the bridge portions as defined by Title 49

CFR Part 239. FRA safety requirements have decreased the risk to passengers utilizing Amtrak as a means of transportation. A detailed discussion of accident prevention and statistics is presented below in the Environmental Impacts section.

In addition to standard safety regulations, the proposed project would require further safety measures due to the bridge that would span U.S. Route 101 (U.S. 101) and the trestle segment on the west side of the Los Angeles River. Elevated rail is common throughout the United States, carrying everything from freight to heavy and light passenger rail.

3-13.1.3 California Public Utilities Commission

CPUC regulates privately owned electric, telecommunications, natural gas, water, and transportation companies, and rail safety. The CPUC Rail Safety and Carriers Division has regulatory and safety oversight over railroads and rail transit systems. CPUC coordinates with FRA to ensure that railroads comply with federal railroad safety regulations resulting from the 1970 Federal Railroad Safety Act and Title 49 CFR. CPUC conducts safety inspections of all main line and branch line trackage, and railroad mechanical repair facilities annually.

The Rail Safety and Crossings Division implements the safety program for construction of all new at-grade and grade separated crossings. Therefore, the proposed track would be designed to meet all federal and CPUC safety standards and incorporate federal design specifications to withstand seismic events.

3-13.1.4 Local Security

Security measures are also employed within and around Union Station. Providing a secure environment for passengers is the responsibility of the City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Amtrak Police, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD), which patrol Union Station and the MTA Red and Blue Lines. In addition to officers patrolling the terminal areas, Union Station and its platforms contain surveillance cameras that are monitored by security personnel. Security personnel detecting a security problem inform LAPD and/or LASD personnel, who then proceed to the scene. In addition, conductors aboard both Amtrak and Metrolink trains act as security personnel for confirmation of paid tickets and removal of non-ticketed passengers. (See Section 3-4, Public Facilities and Services, for an in-depth discussion of policing at Union Station and railroad right-of-way).

3-13.1.5 Passenger Safety and Security

Proper signage is another safety measure used by Union Station and Amtrak to educate passengers regarding safety measures to use on station platforms and while riding trains. Common passenger safety signage includes instructions to stand behind painted lines while waiting on the platform, to never run on the platform, to use handrails when ascending or descending stairs onboard, and to not lean on doors or hold them open. As a community service, Metrolink provides rail safety presentations and safety courses for schools, organizations, and communities to better educate the public on how to be safe in and around trains and their stations.

Proposed safety and security measures that would be incorporated into the proposed project design that are not standard (i.e., above and beyond federal and state requirements) are discussed below in the Environmental Impacts section.

3-13.2 Environmental Impacts

Safety and security analysis is required under NEPA, but not under CEQA. Therefore, this section is written for NEPA analysis only.

3-13.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

This analysis utilized a literature review as an evaluation methodology to determine if safety and security impacts from the proposed project were adverse. A review of the aforementioned federal and local agencies' safety standards and guidelines, in addition to Amtrak and Union Station specific documentation, are listed below.

- FRA—Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 209 to 240, railroad safety measures.
- Amtrak/Union Station—Local Emergency Evacuation Plan/Emergency Action Plan, September 2002. The revised plan would include a special circumstances section for the bridge portions, as defined by Title 49 CFR Part 239.
- Union Station Safety Procedure Plan, HDR Engineering, Inc., 2002.
- Metrolink Emergency Response Plan, 2002.

3-13.2.2 Impact Criteria

The proposed project is complex in its engineering and construction phasing. These complexities involve several levels of safety and security considerations. Because the project would be constructed while Union Station continues to operate, and while U.S. 101 would maintain traffic flow (albeit, with reduced travel lanes during support column construction), two critical safety-related documents would be required in the contract documents and the contractor's site-specific safety plan (Safety Plan). The phasing plan, which is part of the contract documents, would also be included. These documents outline how the project would be constructed to provide the highest level of safety to the construction workers, the general public utilizing Union Station, motorists traveling on U.S. 101, and pedestrians and motorists in the vicinity of the elevated structures. Development of these plans would provide safety measures for creation of a construction zone that would safely facilitate the movement of thousands of people, hundreds of trains, and numerous construction vehicles. Compromised safety standards could lead to injuries, damaged equipment/structures, or fatalities.

Should the proposed project fail to prepare and/or implement any of the required safety measures or plans outlined above, impacts to safety and security would be adverse (under NEPA).

Because the potential impacts to safety and security are essentially identical for Alternatives A and A-1, construction-period and long-term impacts described under Alternative A represent a collective impact discussion for both Alternatives.

3-13.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

The safety procedure plan identifies two major planning elements that would outline safety requirements for the construction period. The contract documents and the Safety Plan would be used to create a safe working environment for construction employees and to protect the public from harm.

a. No-Build Alternative

Amtrak has FRA safety requirements incorporated into its operations, and Union Station operates under Amtrak’s Local Emergency Evacuation Plan/Emergency Action Plan. Under the No-Build Alternative, both the incorporated safety measures and the emergency plan would continue to provide a safe and secure environment for the public and Amtrak employees. No impact (under NEPA) to safety and security would result from the No-Build Alternatives. It is assumed that the Eastside LRT Extension would also be implemented in accordance with the Local Emergency Evacuation Plan/Emergency Action Plan, so there would be no adverse (under NEPA) safety and security impacts.

b. Alternative A

The contract documents and Safety Plan would be utilized during the construction phase to provide a safe environment for the general public, Union Station personnel, and construction employees.

The contract documents would include standard safety provision for areas such as equipment safety and emergency response. Detailed elements within the documents include provision for suitable access through construction, defining work limits with suitable time schedules, and providing accurate notice to passengers before each work phase begins. Additionally, the contract documents would outline the following specific regulatory safety requirements.

- Completion of “Roadway Worker” training would be required of any worker to perform tasks within the railroad right-of-way or 25 feet of live track.
- Paths of travel for pedestrians, vehicular traffic, and construction vehicles would be well-defined and maintained throughout the construction phase. These travel paths would allow for minimum side and overhead clearances, effective barriers, safe travel surfaces, clear signing, and temporary lighting as defined by CPUC and FRA regulations.
- Travel paths for baggage carts would be clearly defined with signage and protective barriers because complete separation of the baggage and pedestrian paths would not be possible during construction.
- Code-compliant emergency exits would be maintained at all times.

- Barriers and signage would be properly placed to separate construction traffic from travel paths defined for general public ingress and egress.
- Specific provisions would be implemented to protect workers and the general public from hazards such as creosote ties, contaminated soils, utility installation, and excavation activities.
- Emergency access routes would be defined and approved through coordination with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department and maintained at all times through the duration of the project construction.

These safety measures would also be applicable during the construction of the U.S. 101 railroad bridge and other elevated portions of the project. The Safety Plan would be implemented during the construction phase to address the specific safety issues related to elevated construction. Approval by the Department of all work to be done over U.S. 101 would be required, while the City of Los Angeles Fire Department and LAPD would review the project plans for inclusion of their desired safety measures. The Safety Plan and the contract documents would outline the following required safety measures to protect vehicles and construction employees.

- Active lanes and closed lanes on U.S. 101 would be clearly defined with barriers and comprehensive signage and striping.
- Placement of whole-span, precast-concrete, or steel forms would require the use of large cranes within the closed lane sections of the freeway. Extensive planning would determine crane placement, swing arc and capacity, barrier and signage locations, and advanced warning signage.
- Safety railings and safety netting would be incorporated for fall safety requirements for workers and for vehicle protection against falling objects.
- Falsework support protection from freeway traffic must be maintained throughout construction.

Implementation of the construction documents and the Safety Plan would bring the proposed project into compliance with FRA and CPUC regulations. Strict compliance with the outlined elements of both safety documents and execution of care within any and all construction areas would minimize the potential for safety and security impacts. Therefore, no adverse (under NEPA) safety impacts are anticipated.

c. Alternative A-1

Safety and security impacts under Alternative A-1 would be the same as for Alternative A.

3-13.2.4 Long-term Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

Because the No-Build Alternative would result in no changes to the existing environment, there would be no long-term impacts to safety and security. It is assumed that other transportation projects in the area would be implemented with safety and security plans and that there would be no adverse effects (under NEPA).

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Operation of the proposed project would continue to be subject to FRA rules and regulations outlined under Title 49 CFR Parts 209 through 240, as they pertain to active transportation of passengers and railcar/engine safety. Because the potential for accidents exists as a reality of train operation, all accidents above a reporting threshold are to be reported to FRA within the required timeframe. Should an accident occur, and injuries are involved, emergency assistance would be provided by local city and county fire and police/sheriff units.

Operation of the proposed project would also comply with safety regulations and prevention guidelines established under the Amtrak Emergency Action Plan. Guidelines outlined in this operational document are “intended to insure that Amtrak’s Los Angeles Union Station is adequately prepared to respond quickly and effectively to protect and preserve the lives and safety of all employees and others who may be in the facility if a fire, an earthquake or other similar emergency should occur.”

The plan documents how Union Station and Amtrak would be prepared to deal with situations such as a fire, an earthquake, a chemical or bio-chemical spill, and other natural or human-induced emergencies. Full participation of all employees during an emergency is expected, and semi-annually, a full-scale emergency drill is conducted to test current employees’ knowledge of the plan. Similarly, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority has an emergency response plan that outlines the same preparedness measures.

As previously mentioned, both plans would be revised to meet the emergency needs associated with the addition of the proposed project, including a special circumstances section for the bridge and trestle portions, as defined by Title 49 CFR Part 239.

It should be noted that CPUC regulates rail safety, including the safety of highway/rail at-grade crossings. However, both Alternatives A and A-1 do not require any at-grade crossings. Hence, this regulatory action administered by CPUC not would be required for the proposed project.

Compliance with the emergency plan and all safety regulations directed by FRA and CPUC would create a safe and secure operating environment for employees and the general public. In addition, local passenger safety measures currently being implemented would continue; therefore, the operation of the proposed project would have no adverse (under NEPA) impacts on safety and security.

c. Alternative A-1

Safety and security impacts during operation under Alternative A-1 would be the same as for Alternative A.

3-13.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

a. Construction-Period Impacts

Many related projects (see Appendix K) are in the area, which are varied in their project goals. All of these projects, if cleared for construction, would have to comply with safety and security measures related to that particular project. Federal and state guidelines apply to all construction sites, and compliance with those requirements make those sites safe for workers and the general public. Generally, construction sites are isolated zones that are separated from the general public and do not present a safety risk. This proposed project and three other proposed projects—the Eastside LRT Extension, the U.S. 101 Decking (City of Los Angeles), and the widening of U.S. 101 (the Department)—would require U.S. 101 to stay open during construction, placing vehicles in the construction zone. Although it is not expected that all of these projects would be under construction at the same time, it is possible that the proposed project construction schedule would overlap with at least one of the above related projects. Should that be the case, there could be a cumulative effect on the safety of vehicles traveling on U.S. 101. As previously stated, this project would implement both contract documents and a Safety Plan, both of which would be approved by the Department to ensure that all safety regulations are in place to protect workers and vehicles driving on its facility. It is anticipated that other related projects would have similar construction documents for safety and that, cumulatively, there would be no increase in safety risk during multiple project construction. Hence, there would be no adverse impacts (under NEPA) to safety and security due to cumulative project construction.

b. Long-term Impacts

Once operational, these projects would provide grade-separated access over U.S. 101. Several existing bridges span U.S. 101 within a short segment of the freeway as vehicle traffic flows northbound or southbound near downtown Los Angeles. These existing elevated structures present no safety risk to the vehicles traveling underneath them (or over them), and it is anticipated that the proposed project and any of the related projects would also present no additional safety risk. Therefore, there are no cumulative impacts (under NEPA) related to the proposed project and other related projects proposed to span U.S. 101.

3-13.3 Potential Mitigation

Compliance with federal and state safety and security regulations is not optional for railroad construction or operation. By law, FRA is responsible for promoting railroad safety nationwide and enforcing federally mandated safety standards. Additionally, local fire department safety measures will be incorporated into the project plans. Hence, all safety- and security-related documents, plans, and procedures are required and, therefore, are not considered mitigation. No additional mitigation measures are required.

3-12 RAILROAD OPERATIONS

Information on existing and future operations for the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project is based on the following report: Final Operations Report–Draft, Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project, HDR, February 17, 2003.

3-12.1 Existing Conditions

3-12.1.1 Regulatory Framework

a. Federal Railroad Administration

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) was created pursuant to Section 3(e)(1) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 U.S.C. 103). FRA's purpose is to promulgate and enforce rail safety regulations, administer railroad assistance programs, conduct research and development in support of improved railroad, and consolidate government support of rail transportation activities. FRA also plays an active role in the development of the country's intercity rail passenger system. In addition to its participation in high-speed rail (HSR) corridor development, maglev deployment, and HSR technology development and deployment, FRA is also involved in administering funding to, and supporting the development of policy regarding the nation's existing intercity passenger rail systems. FRA's activities in this area, which are integrated into the agency's other railroad development efforts, include administering federal grants to Amtrak and supporting the U.S. Secretary of Transportation in his capacity as a member of Amtrak's board of directors. FRA also administers federal funding to smaller rail development programs in response to specific Congressional mandates.

b. Amtrak

Amtrak was created by Congress in the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 24301), under which the nation's freight railroads were relieved of their statutory obligations to continue to provide passengers service as part of their common carrier responsibilities. The act created Amtrak as a quasi-public, for-profit corporation that operates intercity passenger rail services in 46 states and the District of Columbia. The railroad's official name is the National Railroad Passenger Corporation. Amtrak began service on May 1, 1971, and is the nation's largest provider of contract-commuter service for state and regional authorities, including the Coasters and Metrolink in California. The U.S. Secretary of Transportation serves on the Amtrak Board of Directors. Amtrak also receives funding from federal grants through FRA.

In March 2001, Amtrak published the California Passenger Rail System 20-Year Rail Improvement Plan (Department 2002). This plan summarizes months of study and cooperation between rail service providers and statewide planning agencies, including Amtrak, the Department, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA), commuter agencies, and the freight railroads. The plan lays out a course of actions over the next 20 years intended to provide more Amtrak passenger service on existing passenger lines, new Amtrak service, and

improvements for commuter trains and freight movements in California. Within the 20-year plan, an integrated capital improvement program identifies immediate, near-term, and vision improvements and projects. The proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project is included on the Pacific Surfliner Corridor Immediate Projects List for implementation within the next 3 years.

c. California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates privately owned electric, telecommunications, natural gas, water, and transportation companies, in addition to household goods movers and rail safety. CPUC has regulatory and safety oversight over railroads and rail transit systems. CPUC's Railroad Safety Branch provides safety oversight of heavy freight and passenger railroads and employs federally certified staff inspectors. CPUC coordinates with FRA, and is the largest participating state agency in the nation to ensure that railroads comply with federal railroad safety regulations resulting from the 1970 Federal Railroad Safety Act and codified in Part 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). CPUC's Rail Transit Safety Section is responsible for overseeing the safety of public transit guideways. The commission's program ensures that transit agencies have and follow system safety programs that integrate safety in all facets of transit system operations. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) is one of the six major transit systems regulated by the PUC.

d. California Transportation Commission

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) was established in 1978 by Assembly Bill 402 (Chapter 1106, Statutes of 1977) to form a single, unified California transportation policy. CTC is responsible for the programming and allocating of funds for the construction of highway, passenger rail, and transit improvements throughout California. CTC also advises and assists the state secretary of the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, and the State Legislature, in formulating and evaluating state policies and plans for California's transportation programs. This commission is also an active participant in the initiation and development of state and federal legislation to secure financial stability for the state's transportation needs.

e. California Department of Transportation/Amtrak

The State of California finances operation of three Amtrak routes within the state, including both operating and capital grants for station and equipment improvement. Through a partnership between the Department and Amtrak, the state-subsidized intercity rail and feeder bus system provide passenger service throughout California. The Pacific Surfliner route serves southern coastal California, connecting the cities of San Diego, Los Angeles, Oxnard, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo. In 2002, the Department presented the California State Rail Plan, covering 2001 to 2010, to the CTC. The passenger element of the State Rail Plan reviews the current operations of the three state-supported intercity rail passenger routes and outlines 10-year plans for capital improvements and service expansions for Fiscal Years 2001-02 through 2010-11; addresses the Department's vision for intercity rail, and its standards for achievement of 10-year goals within that vision; and discusses potential new routes and services, including HSR. The

State Rail Plan also incorporates the results of Amtrak's 20-year Improvement Program for California (Amtrak 2001).

f. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

MTA serves as transportation planner, coordinator, designer, builder, and operator for rail and bus transit service throughout Los Angeles County. MTA currently operates a bus fleet and approximately 60 miles of Metro Rail (light rail transit [LRT]) services, a portion of which is the subway system below ground level at Union Station. MTA is also responsible for planning and programming the county's intermodal transportation system, including commuter rail, transit, highways, arterial streets, bikeways, pedestrian connections, and demand reduction strategies. MTA, as the state-designated planning and programming agency for Los Angeles County, submits recommended projects and programs to the Southern California Association of Governments for inclusion in its Regional Transportation Plan, which makes MTA eligible for federal funding, and SCAG's Regional Transportation Improvement Plan, which makes MTA eligible for state and federal funding. In April 2001, the MTA Board adopted the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), a 25-year blueprint for transportation planning in Los Angeles County through 2025. The LRTP assesses projected future county population increases, revenues, and resources, and available options for transportation system and mobility improvements.

g. Southern California Regional Rail Authority

In June 1990, the California legislature enacted Senate Bill 1402, Chapter Four of Division 12 of the Public Utilities Code. The bill required the transportation commissions of the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino to develop a joint plan for regional transit services within the multicounty region. In August 1991, SCRRA, a joint powers agency, was formed. The purpose of SCRRA is to plan, design, construct, and administer the operation of regional passenger rail lines serving the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. SCRRA named the regional commuter rail system "Metrolink." Metrolink serves more than 35,000 passengers in 50 cities throughout Southern California and is the primary operator of the regional system. SCRRA coordinates train movements, operations, dispatching, and schedules in coordination with the passenger and freight trains (including Amtrak, North County Transit District, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railways, and Union Pacific Railroad) that utilize the regional rail system.

3-12.1.2 Existing Operations

The Union Station passenger terminal was built in 1939 with the cooperation of the region's three principal railroads, the Union Pacific Railroad, the Southern Pacific Railroad, and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway. It served as the transportation gateway into Los Angeles for years before construction of Los Angeles International Airport. The station is a regional, intermodal rail hub and transfer point for the State of California-sponsored (the Department-Amtrak) intercity Pacific Surfliner trains, and the Metrolink trains. The station still services the few remaining Amtrak cross-country passenger trains serving southern California. Union Station serves an average of 171 revenue passenger trains each weekday, consisting of

126 Metrolink¹ intracity commuter trains, 25 Amtrak Pacific Surfliner service trains, and eight Amtrak long-haul intercity trains. The long-haul trains (Coast Starlight from Seattle, Southwest Chief from Chicago, and Sunset Limited from Orlando) end their interstate trips in Los Angeles and begin their return trips from there.

Railroad passengers arriving at Union Station can transfer to two transit modes: subway/light rail and buses. MTA operates the Metro Rail subway system below ground level at Union Station. There are approximately 280 scheduled Metro Red Line movements daily at Union Station. The Metro Red Line serves the downtown Los Angeles area and provides a connection to the Metro Blue Line that serves the area to the south, toward Long Beach. The Gateway Center provides a bus terminal and park-and-ride facility to improve connections between buses and trains. Union Station is connected to the Patsouras Transit Center bus facility at the adjoining MTA headquarters building adjacent to and just northeast of the station. Local shuttles (DASH), Amtrak bus service, rental car services, and taxis are available at the center. The Metro Gold Line, currently in construction, will link Union Station with Chinatown, Highland Park, and Pasadena. In the future, Union Station will likely be a major destination in the proposed HSR system for California.

MTA estimates that about 40,000 persons per weekday make use of the Union Station complex (*Los Angeles Times* 2003). Within the next decade, MTA estimates that the opening of the Gold Line extensions to Claremont and East Los Angeles would add another 20,000 daily riders.

a. Tracks

Union Station includes 10 active stub-ended passenger tracks (Tracks 3 through 12) that serve Platform Nos. 2 through 6. There is an escape track located between Tracks 7 and 8. The 10 tracks are connected to four lead tracks (Lead Tracks 2 through 5) through a series of switches. The lead tracks provide access into and out off the station, southward from Mission Tower, off the various main line tracks. The area between Mission Tower and the platforms is referred to as the “throat” of Union Station. Arriving and departing trains move through the throat and connect to the various main lines, resulting in the need for many train movements to occur in the peak periods of commuter rail passenger activities (the beginning and end of the business day).

b. Platforms and Tunnel

The 10 passenger tracks are served by five railroad platforms (Platform Nos. 2 through 6) that serve passenger trains (Amtrak and Metrolink). Platform No. 2 is the westernmost railroad platform, servicing Tracks 3 and 4. Each railroad platform is located at surface level. All stub-ended Amtrak and Metrolink railroad tracks are at about the same height with respect to the top of rail elevations. The MTA Gold Line is served by a separate platform (Platform No. 1) that matches the floor height of LRT vehicles. There is also a baggage handling access road at the south end of the station and a pedestrian tunnel under the station tracks. The 8.5-meter-wide (28-foot-wide) pedestrian tunnel provides access between the boarding/alighting platforms and

¹ This number excludes Inland Empire-Orange County trains, which do not pass through Union Station.

the main public areas at Union Station (e.g., ticketing and waiting rooms). The tunnel traverses one level below the surface tracks and platforms and connects the Gateway Center with the main lobby of Union Station. There are two ramps connecting to each of the five railroad platforms, as well as two ramps connecting to the Gold Line Platform. Only some of the ramps have been changed to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Union Station previously included Platforms Nos. 7 and 8, but these were removed to create parking for the mail facility and for construction of MTA headquarters.

3-12.1.3 Union Station Operating Requirements

The function of Union Station as a transit hub requires the following:

- Track capacity and configuration to handle the movement of passenger trains
- Platform capacity to handle loading and unloading of train passengers, especially during peak periods
- Pedestrian capacity in the tunnel that connects the platforms and provides main access to the Metro Red Line subway and the Patsouras Transit Center bus facility
- Ramp capacity and configuration for the movements between the pedestrian tunnel and the train platforms
- Accessibility provisions for disabled passengers
- Ancillary activities necessary for the trains to function (e.g., baggage service and maintenance service).

As discussed in Section 3-12.1.2, the current operation of the station requires trains to pull into the terminal and reverse direction after unloading or loading passengers. All trains must enter and exit through the same set of lead tracks to connect to the main line, whether these trains are starting, ending, or continuing trips beyond the station. In addition, there are numerous nonrevenue (i.e., passenger) train movements required in the Union Station terminal in order to service passenger train equipment and position the equipment at the station platforms for revenue service. Due to the current stub-end configuration of the terminal, trains are subject to delays either at the station platforms or on connecting tracks while awaiting a slot at the platforms or access back onto the main lines. All trains must leave Union Station in reverse direction, causing significant service delays and increased run times for intercity and commuter rail passenger service. The current one-way in-and-out configuration also limits the ultimate capacity of the station.

3-12.1.4 Forecasted Growth

SCRRA has begun a systemwide planning effort to address long-term commuter needs. Based on working estimates (SCRRA 2002), approximately 56 commuter trains (Metrolink and Amtrak) would be added by 2010 (for a total of 182), and another 53 would be added between

2010 and 2025 for a total of 235. In addition to adding new trains, SCRRA would increase capacity on existing trains by adding more cars. SCRRA has undertaken a program of station improvements throughout its system to enable extension of trains to consist of three to ~~four~~ eight cars. Working forecasts from SCRRA indicate that ridership through Union Station would reach about 37,000 passengers by 2010, and more than 60,000 passengers by 2025. The addition of Amtrak trains would occur primarily in the midday period, while for SCRRA most growth would occur primarily in the morning and evening peak commuter periods, although some SCRRA growth would also occur during the midday period.

The Department's State Rail Plan incorporates the results of Amtrak's 20-year improvement program for California and includes several objectives for the 2001 to 2011 period that affect Union Station:

- Increase annual ridership by 52%, from 1,662,000 to 2,518,000.
- Increase frequency of daily round-trip service from 11 to 16 trains between Los Angeles and San Diego, from four to six between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara/Goleta, and from one to two trains extended beyond Goleta to San Luis Obispo.
- Reduce train-running times to less than 2 hours between Los Angeles and San Diego, 2 hours between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara/Goleta, and 2 hours between Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo.
- Improve the reliability (on-time performance) of trains.

3-12.2 Environmental Impacts

FRA's procedures for considering environmental impacts require analysis of impacts on passenger and freight transportation for an environmental impact statement (EIS). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require this section to be covered for an environmental impact report (EIR). This section is written for NEPA standards only and specifically addresses rail operations. Vehicle traffic and transportation impacts are addressed in Section 3-15, Traffic and Transportation.

3-12.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

An extensive data bank of actual train movements and signal circuit information was compiled in conjunction with preparation of the Final Operations Report (HDR 2003). Existing and projected track configurations, train schedules, train operating requirements, other train operating information, and ridership projections were obtained from Amtrak and Metrolink. The requirements of the two major freight railroads that operate near Union Station were also obtained. Based on this information, preliminary operating schedules were developed for passenger trains that could be expected to operate in 2010 (upon completion of improvements) and later, in 2025, when significantly increased passenger train traffic is anticipated.

The optimum method of scheduling trains and assigning station tracks at Union Station was determined and then checked by computer modeling that designed specifically for this project. This method enabled identification of track, signal, and other operational requirements needed in 2010 and 2025. Additional capacity and operating improvements were also identified.

An extensive series of computerized train handling simulations was conducted to determine the operational aspects and requirements that would be involved in handling trains safely via the newly elevated alignment of the run-through tracks. The flow of passengers and vehicles that would use the station platforms, ramps, stairwells, and the main passenger tunnel was estimated to determine station capacity for projected 2010 and 2025 activity.

3-12.2.2 Impact Criteria

FRA does not contain specific significance criteria in the U.S. Department of Transportation FRA Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (2002). For the purposes of this analysis, impacts are considered adverse under NEPA if project implementation results in:

- Constraints to track, platform, pedestrian, ramp, access capacity, or ancillary activities associated with safe operation of the station facilities
- Significant service delays to commuter rail passenger service.

3-12.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the proposed station improvements and run-through tracks would not be built. No short-term alteration to access and station operations during the 2-year construction period would occur.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

In the operations analysis, the capacity of the platforms, connecting ramps, and the pedestrian tunnel to serve railroad passengers were considered concurrently with proposed changes/improvements to track configurations. The effects on Union Station facilities relative to LRT, subway, and bus transit services adjacent to the station were also included. The proposed construction of the run-through tracks would require a change in elevation of those platforms to be served by the run-through facility. This is necessary to achieve an increase in height of the rail structure in order to pass over U.S. 101 with sufficient vertical clearance. Because Platform Nos. 2 through 6 are needed to provide passenger access for the current level of service, in order to avoid impacts to that service during construction, new platforms would need to be built before those platforms requiring elevation changes are removed from service. The area available for the replacement platforms is the location now used for mail operations. By rebuilding the previous Platform Nos. 7 and 8, along with Tracks 13 through 16 (which are currently not in service), the passenger and train capacities of Union Station would be retained while the run-through platforms (Platform Nos. 2 and 3) and tracks (Tracks 3 through 6) are changed.

Based on the analysis conducted for the proposed project, a separate operating plan was developed to verify that the project could be constructed without adversely impacting train operations. Based on an estimated construction period from 2007 to 2010, a two-phased implementation plan was developed for the project. In Phase I, modifications to tracks and switches in the “throat” area of tracks that lead into Union Station, and two additional station platforms (Platform Nos. 7 and 8) and four additional station tracks (Tracks 13 through 16), would be constructed and placed in service before initiating construction of the run-through tracks. Tracks 3, 4, 5, and 6 would then be removed from service for the duration of construction. Access and a portion of the station operations would be shifted east to the newly built Platform Nos. 7 and 8 and Tracks 13 through 16. During Phase 2, Platform Nos. 2 and 3 and the run-through tracks (Tracks 3 through 6) would be raised in elevation. Modifications to the throat tracks and switches would occur at night and off-peak times. Therefore, the current level of passenger commuter service at Union Station would be maintained through the construction period. The operations analysis determined that the proposed construction phasing would not significantly impair station operations based on projected 2010 service levels.

3-12.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

If the proposed run-through tracks are not constructed, operations at Union Station are anticipated to reach capacity in about 2010. Existing Union Station track configuration is projected to accommodate increases in train traffic forecast through 2010—an additional 56 Metrolink trains per day and an additional eight Amtrak trains per day. After that year, as more trains are added, scheduling reliability would begin to deteriorate, especially during peak hours. This deterioration would continue to occur as more trains would attempt to move into and out of Union Station within constrained time periods. If trains were delayed, their planned “slot” for arrival/unloading/loading/departure could be lost, or interfere with the slot of another train. Retention of the stub-end track configuration at Union Station would result in fewer opportunities for schedule recovery as the overall capacity of the current Union Station facility is approached.

Without implementation of the proposed project, Union Station platform and ramp improvements would not be implemented. Beyond 2010, the station would not have sufficient capacity to handle the increase in passengers.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

An operating plan was developed to ensure an operation in which commuter passenger trains would have a clear path to and from Union Station, free of interference, when all trains arrived and departed on schedule. The operating analysis for the project determined that the track and signal configurations of the run-through tracks in 2025 would be sufficient to handle the volume of trains projected. Upon implementation of the Build Alternatives, the constraining conditions of the stub-end track configuration would be eliminated. The facility would also have the additional capacity and flexibility to handle emergency or irregular train operations. The improved and expanded station facilities would satisfactorily handle the projected passenger

flows for both 2010 and 2025. The proposed modifications/additions to the Unions Station track configurations and the related facilities at Union Station, therefore, would be sufficient to handle the projected volume of trains and passengers for both 2010 and 2025.

3-12.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

The Build Alternatives under consideration were selected through initial, secondary, and supplemental screening processes, based on engineering and operations criteria relative to track design, freight and passenger rail operations during construction and operations, and environmental criteria. The two alternatives include the concepts that were evaluated to have minimal potential for conflicts with other transportation projects (including the Eastside LRT Extension, Pasadena Gold Line, U.S. 101 widening, 1st Street Bridge widening, Commercial Street widening, Union Station traffic circulation improvements, and HSR and Maglev conceptual terminal locations at Union Station). The Pasadena Gold Line LRT station modifications are currently in construction and will be completed by 2004. Construction of the Eastside LRT Extension is planned to begin in 2003. U.S. 101 widening is expected to be completed by 2008, when construction of the run-through tracks would commence. HSR and Maglev alignments and stations currently are conceptual. Based on the evaluation of potential conflicts with related projects, the current design and phasing of the run-through track alternatives does not preclude the 1st Street Bridge widening, Union Station traffic circulation improvements, or HSR or Maglev project from occurring in the future. Alternate rail operating plans would be developed to ensure that the station facilities and commuter passenger rail services would not be impaired below their current levels of service during development of the two projects. Cumulative impacts to rail operations and service levels from implementation of the proposed project and related projects are not expected to occur.

3-12.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternatives A and A-1

While Amtrak was created by a federal mandate to provide intercity rail passenger service, there are no specific federal (or state) regulations that require trains to run and maintain a specific level of service or operations. Relative to safety, CPUC would require compliance with federal railroad safety regulations during construction of the Build Alternatives. During construction, the project would comply with the federal safety regulations and policies for workers and passengers as the ongoing station and rail operations continue to provide service. The proposed construction phasing has been developed to ensure that work would not significantly impair station operations.

b. Long Term

Alternatives A and A-1

There are no federal (or state) regulations that require trains to run and maintain a specific level of service or operations. Relative to safety, CPUC would require compliance with federal railroad safety regulations during operation of the Build Alternatives. With the implementation of the run-through tracks and station improvements, long-term rail operations will continue to comply with SCRRA's requirements for planning, design, administration, and operation of its regional passenger rail lines. The improvements would be consistent with Amtrak/the Department, MTA, and SCRRA capital improvement and regional transportation improvements plans for passenger rail.

Impacts to rail operations after regulatory compliance would be not adverse (under NEPA).

3-12.3 Potential Mitigation

3-12.3.1 Construction Period

No adverse effects (under NEPA) to rail operations would occur during construction of Alternatives A or A-1. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

3-12.3.2 Long Term

No long-term adverse effects (under NEPA) to rail operations would occur during operation of Alternatives A or A-1. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

3-12.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-12.4.1 Construction Period

As noted above, no mitigation measures for the construction period relative to rail operations are required. Rail operation impacts would remain not adverse (under NEPA).

3-12.4.2 Long Term

As noted above, no mitigation measures for long-term rail operations impacts are required. Rail operation impacts would remain not adverse (under NEPA).

3-11 NOISE AND VIBRATION

This section summarizes the analysis of potential airborne noise and groundborne vibration impact from the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. Please refer to the Noise and Vibration Technical Report in Appendix G of this document for details of the analysis.

3-11.1 Existing Conditions

3-11.1.1 Existing Noise Conditions


Noise is typically defined as unwanted or undesirable sound, where sound is characterized by small air pressure fluctuations above and below the atmospheric pressure. The basic parameters of environmental noise that affect human subjective response are (1) intensity or level, (2) frequency content and (3) variation with time. The first parameter is determined by how greatly the sound pressure fluctuates above and below the atmospheric pressure, and is expressed on a compressed scale in units of decibels (dB). By using this scale, the range of normally encountered sound can be expressed by values between 0 and 120 dB. On a relative basis, a 3-dB change in sound level generally represents a barely-noticeable change outside the laboratory, whereas a 10-dB change in sound level would typically be perceived as a doubling (or halving) in the loudness of a sound.

The frequency content of noise is related to the tone or pitch of the sound, and is expressed based on the rate of the air pressure fluctuation in terms of cycles per second (called Hertz, and abbreviated as Hz). The human ear can detect a wide range of frequencies from about 20 Hz to 17,000 Hz. However, because the sensitivity of human hearing varies with frequency, the A-weighting system is commonly used when measuring environmental noise to provide a single number descriptor that correlates with human subjective response. Sound levels measured using this weighting system are called “A-weighted” sound levels, and are expressed in decibel notation as “dBA.” The A-weighted sound level is widely accepted by acousticians as a proper unit for describing environmental noise.

Because environmental noise fluctuates from moment to moment, it is common practice to condense all of this information into a single number, called the “equivalent” sound level (L_{eq}). L_{eq} can be thought of as the steady sound level that represents the same sound energy as the varying sound levels over a specified time period (typically 1 hour or 24 hours). Often the L_{eq} values over a 24-hour period are used to calculate cumulative noise exposure in terms of the Day-Night Sound Level (L_{dn}). L_{dn} is the A-weighted L_{eq} for a 24-hour period with an added 10-dB penalty imposed on noise that occurs during the nighttime hours (between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.). Many surveys have shown that L_{dn} is well correlated with human annoyance; therefore, this descriptor is widely used for environmental noise impact assessment. Figure 3-11.1 provides examples of typical noise environments and criteria in terms of L_{dn} . While the extremes of L_{dn} are shown to range from 35 dBA in a wilderness environment to 85 dBA in noisy urban environments, L_{dn} is generally found to range between 55 dBA and 75 dBA in most communities.

Typical Transportation Noises

Typical A-Weighted Sound Levels at 100 Feet



Source: Harris, Miller, Miller, & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-11.1: Examples of Typical Outdoor Noise Exposure

As shown on Figure 3-11.1, this spans the range between an “ideal” residential environment and the threshold for an unacceptable residential environment according to U.S. Federal agency criteria.

Noise-sensitive land use along the project corridor was identified based on aerial photographs and visual surveys. The land-use along the project corridor is primarily industrial and commercial. Noise-sensitive land use in the project area is limited to two residential lofts located near the alignment. Existing ambient noise levels were characterized through direct measurements at two representative sites in this area. The results of the existing ambient noise measurements are summarized below in Table 3-11.1, and the measurement sites are described below. Figure 3-11.2 shows the ambient noise measurement locations.

| Table 3-11.1: Noise Measurement Locations | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|-------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Site Number | Measurement Location Description | Start of Measurement | | Meas. Time (hrs) | Noise Exposure (dBA) | | |
| | | Date | Time | | L _{dn} | L _{eq} | |
| N-1 | Residential Lofts @ 100 block Center St. and Banning St. | 12/19/02 | 12:00 | 24 | 68 | | |
| N-2 | Residential Lofts @ 611 Ducommun St. and N Garey St. | 11/6/02 | 9:07 | 1 | 63* | 65 | |

Note: * L_{dn} was estimated from L_{eq} measurement at this location using the method described in the FTA Guidance Manual.


Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Site N-1 was located at the cold storage facility directly to the north of the residential lofts in the 100 block of Center Street. The microphone was located at the same setback as the lofts. Trains, including the MTA Red Line, Amtrak, and Metrolink were the dominant noise sources. Other sources included traffic on 1st Street and local traffic. The measured L_{dn} at this site was 68 dBA.

Site N-2 was located at the residential lofts at 611 Ducommun Street. Noise sources included traffic on U.S. 101 and local traffic. Because no location was available at this site in which to leave a long-term noise monitor, a short-term noise measurement was conducted and the L_{dn} was estimated using methods detailed in the FTA Guidance Manual. The measured L_{eq} was 65 dBA, and the estimated L_{dn} was 63 dBA.

3-11.1.2 Existing Vibration Conditions

Groundborne vibration is the oscillatory motion of the ground about some equilibrium position that can be described in terms of displacement, velocity, or acceleration. Because sensitivity to vibration typically corresponds to the amplitude of vibration velocity within the low-frequency range of most concern for environmental vibration (roughly 5-100 Hz), velocity is the preferred measure for evaluating groundborne vibration from transit projects.



Source: Harris, Miller, Miller, & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-11.2: Noise Measurement Locations

The most common measure used to quantify vibration amplitude is the peak particle velocity (PPV), defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibratory motion. PPV is typically used in monitoring blasting and other types of construction-generated vibration, since it is related to the stresses experienced by building components. Although PPV is appropriate for evaluating building damage, it is less suitable for evaluating human response, which is better related to the average vibration amplitude. Thus, groundborne vibration from transit trains is usually characterized in terms of the “smoothed” root mean square (rms) vibration velocity level, in decibels (VdB), with a reference quantity of one micro-inch per second. VdB is used in place of dB to avoid confusing vibration decibels with sound decibels.

Figure 3-11.3 illustrates typical groundborne vibration levels for common sources as well as criteria for human and structural response to groundborne vibration. As shown, the range of interest is from approximately 50 to 100 VdB, from imperceptible background vibration to the threshold of damage. Although the approximate threshold of human perception to vibration is 65 VdB, annoyance is usually not significant unless the vibration exceeds 70 VdB.


Vibration-sensitive land use in the project area is limited to two sets of residential lofts and a business establishment with potentially vibration-sensitive machinery. The only significant sources of existing groundborne vibration in the project area are Amtrak, Metrolink and MTA trains that run along the east side of the project area. The existing vibration conditions in the project area were characterized by measuring the vibration propagation characteristics of the soil a representative location near the vibration sensitive receptors.

Vibration testing was conducted at the three locations shown on Figure 3-11.4, from November 6 to November 7, 2002. A vibration propagation test was conducted at a site to represent the soil conditions in area along the corridor near the vibration-sensitive receptors. The groundborne vibration propagation test was conducted by striking the ground and measuring the input force and corresponding ground vibration response at various distances. The resulting force-response transfer function was combined with the measured input force characteristics of the Amtrak and Metrolink vehicles to predict future vibration levels at locations along the project corridor. Ambient vibration measurements were conducted at the Friedman Bag Company. The vibration propagation test sites are described below.

Site V-1 was located in the parking lot at the corner of Commercial Street and Center Street. This propagation site is representative of the vibration-sensitive receptors along the proposed alignments.

Site V-2 was located near the existing Amtrak and Metrolink tracks behind the police headquarters building. The measurements at this location were used to obtain the input force characteristics for use in the vibration projections.


Site V-3 was located inside the Friedman Bag Company manufacturing building at 706 Ducommun Street. The measurements at this location were conducted to determine the ambient vibration levels at the sensitive equipment in the building.



* RMS Vibration Velocity Level in VdB relative to 10^{-6} inches/second

Source: Harris, Miller, Miller, & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-11.3: Typical Ground-Borne Vibration Levels and Criteria



Source: Harris, Miller, Miller, & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-11.4: Vibration Measurement Locations

3-11.2 Environmental Impacts

3-11.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The noise and vibration levels were projected based on noise and vibration measurements of the existing Amtrak and Metrolink trains, which are detailed in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report in Appendix G. The operating plan was based on the Year 2025 projections for Amtrak trains, and an average of the year 2020 and year 2030 projections for Metrolink trains using the proposed run-through tracks, summarized in Table 3-11.2. Speeds were based on engineering projections, and ranged from 15 mph at the northern end of the alignment to 45 mph at the southern end of the alignment.

| Table 3-11.2: Projected Trains Using the Run-Through Tracks in 2025 | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Time Period | Amtrak Trains | Metrolink Trains | All Trains |
| Daytime (7am-10pm) | 26 | 89 | 115 |
| Nighttime (10pm-7am) | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| 24-Hours | 32 | 102 | 134 |

Source: Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project Consolidated Arrival & Departure Schedule; SCRRRA 30-year demand projections.

3-11.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. Noise Impact Criteria

Noise impact for this project is based on the criteria defined in the U. S. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance manual Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA Report DOT-T-95-16, April 1995). The FTA does not have separate criteria or assessment methodologies for the type of project represented by the Run-Through Tracks Project and relies on the FTA criteria for assessing impacts for railroad projects in urban areas. The FTA noise impact criteria are founded on well-documented research on community reaction to noise and are based on change in noise exposure using a sliding scale. Although higher transit noise levels are allowed in neighborhoods with high levels of existing noise, smaller increases in total noise exposure are allowed with increasing levels of existing noise.

The FTA Noise Impact Criteria group noise sensitive land uses into the following three categories:

- Category 1: Buildings or parks where quiet is an essential element of their purpose.
- Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep. This includes residences, hospitals, and hotels where nighttime sensitivity is assumed to be of utmost importance.
- Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime and evening use. This category includes schools, libraries, churches, and active parks.

L_{dn} is used to characterize noise exposure for residential areas (Category 2). For other noise sensitive land uses, such as outdoor amphitheatres and school buildings (Categories 1 and 3), the maximum 1-hour L_{eq} during the facility's operating period is used.

Two levels of impact are included in the FTA criteria. The interpretation of these two levels of impact is summarized below:

- **Severe:** Severe noise impacts are considered “adverse” as this term is used in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and “significant” as this term is used in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Noise mitigation will normally be specified for severe impact areas unless no practical method exists for mitigating the noise.
- **Impact:** In this range of impact, sometimes referred to as moderate impact, other project-specific factors must be considered to determine the magnitude of the impact and the need for mitigation. These other factors can include the predicted increase over existing noise levels, the types and number of noise-sensitive land uses affected, existing outdoor-indoor sound insulation, and the cost effectiveness of mitigating noise to more acceptable levels.

The noise impact criteria are summarized in Table 3-11.3. The first column shows the existing noise exposure and the remaining columns show the additional noise exposure from the transit project that would cause either moderate or severe impact. The future noise exposure would be the combination of the existing noise exposure and the additional noise exposure caused by the transit project. Table 3-11.4 expresses the same criteria in terms of the increase in total or cumulative noise that can occur before reaching the impact threshold.

b. Vibration Impact Criteria

The FTA groundborne vibration impact criteria are based on land use and train frequency, as shown in Table 3-11.5. Some buildings, such as concert halls, recording studios and theaters, can be very sensitive to vibration but do not fit into any of the three categories listed in Table 3-11.5. Due to the sensitivity of these buildings, they usually warrant special attention during the environmental assessment of a transit project. Table 3-11.6 gives criteria for acceptable levels of groundborne vibration for various types of special buildings. Vibration impacts that exceed FTA criteria are considered to be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) and to warrant mitigation, if reasonable and feasible.

It should also be noted that Table 3-11.5 and Table 3-11.6 include separate FTA criteria for groundborne noise, the “rumble” that can be radiated from the motion of room surfaces in buildings due to groundborne vibration. Although expressed in dBA, which emphasizes the more audible middle and high frequencies, the criteria are set significantly lower than for airborne noise to account for the annoying low-frequency character of groundborne noise. Because airborne noise often masks groundborne noise for aboveground (i.e., at-grade or elevated) rail systems, groundborne noise criteria are primarily applied where airborne noise is not a dominant factor, such as in well-insulated interior spaces of noise-sensitive buildings.

Table 3-11.3: FTA Noise Impact Criteria

| Existing Noise Exposure L_{eq} or L_{dn} | Project Noise Exposure Impact Thresholds, L_{dn} or L_{eq} (dBA) | | | |
|---|--|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Category 1 or 2 Sites | | Category 3 Sites | |
| | Impact | Severe Impact | Impact | Severe Impact |
| <43 | Amb.+10 | Amb.+15 | Amb.+15 | Amb.+20 |
| 43 | 52 | 59 | 57 | 64 |
| 44 | 52 | 59 | 57 | 64 |
| 45 | 52 | 59 | 57 | 64 |
| 46 | 53 | 60 | 58 | 65 |
| 47 | 53 | 60 | 58 | 65 |
| 48 | 53 | 60 | 58 | 65 |
| 49 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 65 |
| 50 | 54 | 60 | 59 | 65 |
| 51 | 54 | 61 | 59 | 66 |
| 52 | 55 | 61 | 60 | 66 |
| 53 | 55 | 61 | 60 | 66 |
| 54 | 55 | 62 | 60 | 67 |
| 55 | 56 | 62 | 61 | 67 |
| 56 | 56 | 63 | 61 | 68 |
| 57 | 57 | 63 | 62 | 68 |
| 58 | 57 | 63 | 62 | 68 |
| 59 | 58 | 64 | 63 | 69 |
| 60 | 58 | 64 | 63 | 69 |
| 61 | 59 | 65 | 64 | 70 |
| 62 | 59 | 65 | 64 | 70 |
| 63 | 60 | 66 | 65 | 71 |
| 64 | 61 | 66 | 66 | 71 |
| 65 | 61 | 67 | 66 | 72 |
| 66 | 62 | 68 | 67 | 73 |
| 67 | 63 | 68 | 68 | 73 |
| 68 | 63 | 69 | 68 | 74 |
| 69 | 64 | 70 | 69 | 75 |
| 70 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 75 |
| 71 | 66 | 71 | 71 | 76 |
| 72 | 66 | 72 | 71 | 77 |
| 73 | 66 | 72 | 71 | 77 |
| 74 | 66 | 73 | 71 | 78 |
| 75 | 66 | 74 | 71 | 79 |
| 76 | 66 | 75 | 71 | 80 |
| 77 | 66 | 75 | 71 | 80 |
| >77 | 66 | 76 | 71 | 81 |

Note: L_{dn} is used for land use where nighttime sensitivity is a factor; maximum 1-hour L_{eq} is used for land use involving only daytime activities.

Source: Federal Transit Administration, "Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment," 1995.

Table 3-11.4: Cumulative Noise Increase Allowed by FTA Criteria

| Existing Noise Exposure L_{eq} or L_{dn} | Impact Threshold for Increase in Cumulative Noise Exposure (dBA) | | | |
|---|--|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Category 1 or 2 Sites | | Category 3 Sites | |
| | Impact | Severe Impact | Impact | Severe Impact |
| 45 | 8 | 14 | 12 | 19 |
| 46 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 18 |
| 47 | 7 | 12 | 11 | 17 |
| 48 | 6 | 12 | 10 | 16 |
| 49 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 16 |
| 50 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 15 |
| 51 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 14 |
| 52 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 14 |
| 53 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 13 |
| 54 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 12 |
| 55 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 12 |
| 56 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 11 |
| 57 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 10 |
| 58 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 10 |
| 59 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| 60 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| 61 | 1.9 | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| 62 | 1.7 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 63 | 1.6 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 64 | 1.5 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 65 | 1.4 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| 66 | 1.3 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| 67 | 1.2 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| 68 | 1.1 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 69 | 1.1 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 70 | 1.0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 71 | 1.0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 72 | 0.8 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 73 | 0.6 | 2 | 1.8 | 5 |
| 74 | 0.5 | 2 | 1.5 | 5 |
| 75 | 0.4 | 2 | 1.2 | 5 |

Note: L_{dn} is used for land use where nighttime sensitivity is a factor; maximum 1-hour L_{eq} is used for land use involving only daytime activities.

Source: Federal Transit Administration, "Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment," 1995.

Table 3-11.5: FTA Groundborne Vibration and Noise Impact Criteria

| Land Use Category | Groundborne Vibration Impact Levels (VdB re 1 micro-inch/sec) | | Groundborne Noise Impact Levels (dB re 20 micro-Pascals) | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Frequent Events ¹ | Infrequent Events ² | Frequent Events ¹ | Infrequent Events ² |
| Category 1: Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operations. | 65 VdB ³ | 65 VdB ³ | -- ⁴ | -- ⁴ |
| Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep. | 72 VdB | 80 VdB | 35 dBA | 43 dBA |
| Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use. | 75 VdB | 83 VdB | 40 dBA | 48 dBA |

Notes:

1. "Frequent Events" is defined as more than 70 vibration events per day. Most rapid transit projects fall into this category.
2. "Infrequent Events" is defined as fewer than 70 vibration events per day. This category includes most commuter rail systems.
3. This criterion limit is based on levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment, such as optical microscopes. Vibration-sensitive manufacturing or research would require detailed evaluation to define the acceptable vibration levels. Ensuring lower vibration levels in a building often requires special design of the HVAC systems and stiffened floors.
4. Vibration-sensitive equipment is not sensitive to groundborne noise.

Source: Federal Transit Administration, "Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment," 1995.

Table 3-11.6: FTA Vibration Impact Criteria for Special Buildings

| Type of Building or Room ³ | Groundborne Vibration Impact Levels (VdB re 1 micro-inch/sec) | | Groundborne Noise Impact Levels (dB re 20 micro-Pascals) | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Frequent Events ¹ | Infrequent Events ² | Frequent Events ¹ | Infrequent Events ² |
| Concert Halls | 65 VdB | 65 VdB | 25 dBA | 25 dBA |
| TV Studios | 65 VdB | 65 VdB | 25 dBA | 25 dBA |
| Recording Studios | 65 VdB | 65 VdB | 25 dBA | 25 dBA |
| Auditoriums | 72 VdB | 80 VdB | 30 dBA | 38 dBA |
| Theaters | 72 VdB | 80 VdB | 35 dBA | 43 dBA |

Notes:

1. "Frequent Events" is defined as more than 70 vibration events per day. Most rapid transit projects fall into this category.
2. "Infrequent Events" is defined as fewer than 70 vibration events per day. This category includes most commuter rail systems.
3. If the building would rarely be occupied when trains are operating, impact need not be considered. As an example, consider locating a commuter rail line next to a concert hall. If no commuter trains operate after 7 pm, trains would rarely interfere with the use of the hall.

Source: Federal Transit Administration, "Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment," 1995.

3-11.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

Temporary noise and vibration during construction of the new trestle has the potential of being intrusive to receptors, such as residential lofts, near the construction sites. Construction noise varies greatly depending on the construction process, type and condition of equipment used, and layout of the construction site. Many of these factors are traditionally left to the contractor's discretion, which makes it difficult to accurately estimate levels of construction noise. Overall, construction noise levels are governed primarily by the noisiest pieces of equipment. For most construction equipment, the engine, which is usually diesel, is the dominant noise source. This is particularly true of engines without sufficient muffling. For special activities such as impact pile driving and pavement breaking, noise generated by the actual process dominates. Construction activities that could cause intrusive vibration include pile driving, vibratory compaction, jackhammers, and use of tracked vehicles such as bulldozers. Please refer to the Noise and Vibration Technical Report in Appendix G of this document for more detail about construction noise and vibration.

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative is not expected to result in any construction-period noise or vibration impacts since no construction of the run-through tracks would occur. The Eastside LRT Project and the 1st Street Bridge widening would occur adjacent to residential properties on either side of the bridge.

b. Alternative A

Based on the criteria and noise projections presented in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report, and assuming that construction noise is reduced by 6 dB for each doubling of distance from the center of the site, screening distances for potential construction noise impact can be estimated. These estimates suggest that the potential for construction noise impact will be minimal for commercial and industrial land use, with impact screening distances of 70 feet (21 meters) and 40 feet (12 meters), respectively. Even for residential land use, the potential for temporary construction noise impact would be limited to locations within about 125 feet (38 meters) of the corridor. Under NEPA, construction period impacts are not considered to be adverse due to their temporary nature. Under CEQA, construction noise can be considered significant. The residential loft at 611 Ducommun Street would be within 30 feet (9.1 meters) of the proposed Alternative A alignment and thus within the 125-foot (38-meter) zone for potential construction noise. However, the rear side of 611 Ducommun Street, which is solid masonry construction, would be exposed to construction activities, which would effectively reduce construction noise.

Alternative A would pass above the commercial property at 711 Ducommun Street. Activities at this site are associated with warehousing and shipping and are thus not noise-sensitive. Construction noise would not create adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts.

c. Alternative A-1

Based on the criteria and noise projections presented in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report, and assuming that construction noise is reduced by 6 dB for each doubling of distance from the center of the site, screening distances for potential construction noise impact can be estimated. These estimates suggest that the potential for construction noise impact will be minimal for commercial and industrial land use, with impact screening distances of 70 feet (21 meters) and 40 feet (12 meters), respectively. Even for residential land use, the potential for temporary construction noise impact would be limited to locations within about 125 feet (38 meters) of the corridor.

Alternative A-1 would be about 250 feet (76 meters) from the residential lofts in the 100 block of Center Street. Because it would be beyond the 125-foot (38-meter) construction noise zone, no periodic construction noise impacts would occur.

3-11.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative is not expected to result in any long-term noise or vibration impacts that would be associated with the Run-Through Tracks Project. The Eastside LRT Project and the 1st Street Bridge widening would create long-term impacts to residential properties on either side of the 1st Street Bridge.

b. Alternative A

For Alternative A, detailed comparisons of the existing and future noise levels are presented in Table 3-11.7. In addition to the civil station, distance to the near track and projected speed, the existing noise level, and the projected noise level the impact criteria for each receptor or receptor group are shown. Based on a comparison of the predicted project noise level with the impact criteria, the impact category is listed. Based on the projections in Table 3-11.7, only one severe noise impact is projected.

| Table 3-11.7: Noise Impact Assessment for Alternative A | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|
| Location | Civil Stn | Dist to Near Track (ft) | Speed (mph) | Exist. Noise Level (dBA) | Project Noise Level (dBA) | | | Impact Category |
| | | | | | Predicted | Impact Criteria | | |
| | | | | | | Impact | Severe | |
| Residential Lofts @ 611 Ducommun St. | 34+00 | 30 | 15 | 63 | 77 | 60 | 65 | Severe* |
| Residential Lofts @ 100 block Center St. | 57+00 | 250 | 45 | 68 | 56 | 63 | 68 | None |

Note: *Severe impact would result at this location only if the residential portion of the building is not taken. If the entire building is taken, no impact would occur.

Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

The estimated RMS velocity levels (VdB re 1 micro-in./sec.) for sensitive receptors at representative distances are provided in Table 3-11.8. The table summarizes the results of the analysis in terms of anticipated exceedances of the FTA criteria for “frequent events” (defined as more than 70 events per day). The criteria are discussed in more detail above.

| Table 3-11.8: Vibration Impact Assessment for Alternative A | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Location | Civil Station | Dist to Near Track (ft) | Speed (mph) | Project Vibration Level* | Vibration Impact Criterion* | Impact? |
| Residential Lofts @ 611 Ducommun St. | 34+00 | 30 | 15 | 52 | 72 | No |
| Friedman Bag Company @ 706 Ducommun St. | 37+00 | 225 | 30 | 46 | 65 | No |
| Residential Lofts @ 100 block Center St. | 57+00 | 250 | 45 | 59 | 72 | No |
| Note: * Vibration levels are measured in VdB reference to 1 µin/sec. | | | | | | |

Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Vibration-sensitive locations along the alignment are listed in Table 3-11.8. The table lists the locations, the civil station, the distance to the near track, and the projected speed at each location. In addition, the predicted project vibration level and the impact criterion level are indicated.

Based on the projections in Table 3-11.8, no vibration impacts would occur. In addition, the projected vibration levels at the Friedman Bag Company manufacturing facility at 706 Ducommun Street would be approximately 15 VdB below the measured ambient vibration levels on the sensitive equipment, so the train activities will not impact operations.

Alternative A would not result in noise impacts to William Meade Homes because the noise levels of passing trains would be the same as existing conditions.

c. Alternative A-1

For Alternative A-1, detailed comparisons of the existing and future noise levels are presented in Table 3-11.9. In addition to the civil station, distance to the near track and projected speed, the existing noise level, and the projected noise level the impact criteria for each receptor or receptor group are shown. Based on a comparison of the predicted project noise level with the impact criteria, the impact category is listed.

Based on the projections in Table 3-11.9, no noise impacts would occur.

The estimated root mean square velocity levels (VdB re 1 micro-in./sec.) for sensitive receptors at representative distances are provided in Table 3-11.10. The table summarizes the results of the analysis in terms of anticipated exceedances of the FTA criteria for “frequent events” (defined as more than 70 events per day). The criteria are discussed in more detail above.

Table 3-11.9: Noise Impact Assessment for Alternative A-1

| Location | Civil Stn | Distance to Near Track (ft) | Speed (mph) | Exist. Noise Level (dBA) | Project Noise Level (dBA) | | | Impact Category |
|--|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|
| | | | | | Predicted | Impact Criteria | | |
| | | | | | | Impact | Severe | |
| Residential Lofts @ 611 Ducommun St. | 33+00 | 210 | 15 | 63 | 56 | 60 | 65 | None |
| Residential Lofts @ 100 block Center St. | 57+00 | 225 | 45 | 68 | 57 | 63 | 68 | None |

Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Table 3-11.10: Vibration Impact Assessment

| Location | Civil Station | Dist to Near Track (ft) | Speed (mph) | Project Vibration Level* | Vibration Impact Criterion* | Impact? |
|--|---------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Residential Lofts @ 611 Ducommun St. | 33+00 | 210 | 15 | 41 | 72 | No |
| Friedman Bag Company @ 706 Ducommun | 35+00 | 400 | 30 | 43 | 65 | No |
| Residential Lofts @ 100 block Center St. | 57+00 | 225 | 45 | 60 | 72 | No |

Note: * Vibration levels are measured in VdB reference to 1 µin/sec.

Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., 2003.

Vibration-sensitive locations along the alignment are listed in Table 3-11.10. Each table lists the locations, the civil station, the distance to the near track, and the projected speed at each location. In addition, the predicted project vibration level and the impact criterion level are indicated.

Based on the projections in Table 3-11.10, no vibration impacts would occur. In addition, the projected vibration levels at the Friedman Bag Company manufacturing facility at 706 Ducommun Street would be approximately 15 VdB below the measured ambient vibration levels on the sensitive equipment, so the train activities will not impact operations.

3-11.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Alternative A would not result in noise impacts to William Meade Homes because the noise levels of passing trains would be the same as existing conditions. Transportation projects occurring in the area could result in potential cumulative impacts to the residential lofts that lie on both sides of the 1st Street Bridge. The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project would not create noise impacts to those properties; however, the Eastside LRT Project and the City of Los Angeles 1st Street Bridge widening project would create new or closer noise sources.

3-11.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternatives A and A-1

It is assumed that construction of the proposed project would need to be in compliance¹ with the requirements Sections 112.03 and 41.40 of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code and any variances to the Code issued by the City. The City regulations basically prohibit construction between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. without a variance. Although the regulations do not include specific daytime noise limits, they do state that construction or repair work shall not be performed "... in such a manner that the noise created thereby is loud, unnecessary and unusual and substantially exceeds the noise customarily and necessarily attendant to the reasonable and efficient performance of such work."

b. Long Term

Alternatives A and A-1

All Amtrak and Metrolink trains will be required to comply with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency noise standards for locomotives and railroad cars as outlined in 40 CFR Part 201. These regulations are enforced by the FRA (see 49 CFR Part 210).

3-11.3 Potential Mitigation

3-11.3.1 Construction Period

a. Alternative A

In addition to voluntary compliance with the restrictions in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, the following measures will be implemented for Alternative A:

CN-1: Noise measurements will be taken at the rear of 611 Ducommun Street after the warehouse property at 620 E. Commercial Street is acquired. Those noise data, in conjunction with an assessment of the noise attenuation provided by the rear façade of 611 Ducommun Street, will be used to determine if a temporary noise attenuation application is needed during construction in the vicinity of 611 Ducommun Street.

Temporary noise attenuation applications may include erection of plywood noise barriers at the construction site, or temporary noise insulation materials at an affected property.

No mitigation for construction-period vibration impacts is needed.

¹ Although FRA and the Department are not legally subject to City of Los Angeles regulations, it is assumed that the project would voluntarily comply with the City's noise regulations to the extent feasible.

b. Alternative A-1

Other than voluntary compliance with the restrictions in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, no noise or vibration mitigation is required.

3-11.3.2 Long Term

Potential mitigation measures for reducing noise impacts from train operations are described below:

- Noise Barriers – This is a common approach to reducing noise impacts from surface transportation sources. The primary requirements for an effective noise barrier are that (1) the barrier must be high enough and long enough to break the line-of-sight between the sound source and the receiver, (2) the barrier must be of an impervious material with a minimum surface density of 20 kg/sq. m (4 lb/sq. ft) and (3) the barrier must not have any gaps or holes between the panels or at the bottom. Because numerous materials meet these requirements, the selection of materials for noise barriers is usually dictated by aesthetics, durability, cost, and maintenance considerations. Depending on the proximity of the barrier to the tracks and on the track elevation, rail system noise barriers typically range in height from between four and twelve feet.
- Building Sound Insulation – Sound insulation of residences and institutional buildings to improve the outdoor-to-indoor noise reduction has been widely applied around airports but has seen limited application for transit projects. Although this approach has no effect on noise in exterior areas, it may be the best choice for sites where noise barriers are not feasible or desirable, and for buildings where indoor sensitivity is of most concern. Substantial improvements in building sound insulation (on the order of 5 to 10 dBA) can often be achieved by adding an extra layer of glazing to the windows, by sealing any holes in exterior surfaces that act as sound leaks, and by providing forced ventilation and air-conditioning so that windows do not need to be opened.

a. Alternative A

For Alternative A, a combination of noise barriers on the trestle segment and sound insulation at the rear of 611 Ducommun Street could be used to mitigate the impact. The mitigation measure designed would need to reduce noise levels by 17 dB in order to resolve the forecasted noise impacts. A combination of noise shielding (on the trestle segment) and sound insulation may be required to provide the necessary noise reduction.

No noise impacts are forecasted at William Meade Homes or the Men’s Central Jail/Twin Towers Correctional Facility. Train traffic through the throat area north of the Union Station platforms would continue at existing noise levels, although the proposed alternative would eliminate some of the in-and-out movements of the trains.

b. Alternative A-1

Alternative A-1 is not expected to result in noise or vibration impacts, so no mitigation is required.

3-11.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-11.4.1 Construction Period

With voluntary compliance with the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, impacts from construction-generated noise should not be adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA).

3-11.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternative A

By construction of a noise barrier on the trestle segment and possibly noise insulation at the rear of 611 Ducommun Street, noise impacts would be reduced to below the impact criteria. No noise impacts would occur at other locations along the segment.

b. Alternative A-1

No noise mitigation is required; therefore, the results would be the same as the impact analysis above.

3-10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

This section analyzes the potential land use impacts associated with the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. The proposed project would be located in the area of downtown Los Angeles that is bound by Cesar Chavez Avenue to the north, 1st Street to the south, Alameda Street to the west, and the Los Angeles River to the east.

The proposed project study area is intended to encompass an area where the potential land use impacts of the proposed project, if any, would be foreseeable. Land use data was collected for the study area by means of field surveys and analysis of applicable land use plans and policies.


3-10.1 Existing Conditions

3-10.1.1 Existing Land Use

For purposes of this analysis, the proposed project area has been divided into four segments. Segment 1 covers Los Angeles Union Station, primarily the area north of U.S. 101 to Bauchet Street, between Alameda Street and the Los Angeles River. Segment 2 includes the U.S. 101 crossing. Segment 3 covers the area south of U.S. 101 to the 1st Street Bridge, between Alameda Street and the Los Angeles River. Segment 4 covers the area where the proposed mail facilities would be relocated, at 16th Street and Santa Fe Avenue (see Figure 3-10.1).

a. Segment 1—Los Angeles Union Station

The northern portion of the proposed project area surrounding Los Angeles Union Station is bounded by Cesar Chavez Avenue, Alameda Street, El Monte Busway, Vignes Street, and the railroad tracks extending to the Los Angeles River. This northern area primarily consists of public facilities, cultural, commercial, and industrial land uses. Union Station serves as a multimodal transportation hub with various types of transit service, including local, regional, and state-wide rail and bus service. In addition, Track 13 at Union Station supports existing U.S. Postal Service mail operations. The Twin Towers Men's Correctional Facility is located at 450 Bauchet Street. Commercial office uses in this area include the Southern California Metropolitan Water District main office, located on Alameda Street. To the northwest of Union Station, north of Cesar Chavez Avenue and Alameda Street, is the U.S. Postal Service Terminal Annex building. Directly east of Union Station are the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) bus transit plaza and the MTA headquarters building. Industrial facilities, such as loading and storage, and repair facilities, are located within the northern and eastern portions of this area. Cultural facilities within this area include the El Pueblo de Los Angeles, located to the west of Union Station across Alameda Street, and the Chinatown District northwest of Union Station.



Source: Southern California Association of Governments, 1993; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-10.1: Existing Land Use

b. Segment 2—U.S. 101 Crossing

The area located beneath the proposed U.S. 101 crossing is used entirely for the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101.

c. Segment 3—Elevated Trestle

Land uses south of U.S. 101 consist primarily of commercial, industrial, warehouse, and live-work residential loft units. Commercial office uses include the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Operations Facility located between Alameda Street and Garey Avenue, from Ducommon Avenue to Temple Street, and the City of Los Angeles Personnel Department office building on Vignes Street and Temple Street. Other commercial facilities are scattered throughout this southern area, in addition to those located south of 1st Street and west of Alameda Street in the Little Tokyo District. The land uses in the area east of Garey Street to the Los Angeles River are primarily industrial and warehouse facilities. These uses include the Friedman Bag Company and the National Cold Storage facility. Cultural facilities in this area include the Japanese Buddhist Temple on the corner of Vignes Street and 1st Street. Live-work loft residential uses are found in the Artist District south of 1st Street, just west of Alameda Street.

d. Mail Facility Relocation Site

As part of the proposed project, the existing mail facility at Union Station would be relocated to the Amtrak yard on 16th Street to make room for the proposed new platform and track additions.

3-10.1.2 Land Use Plans and Policies

Several regional and local land use plans and policies are applicable to the proposed project site and surrounding areas. These plans are described below (see Figure 3-10.2).

a. Southern California Association of Governments Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is designated by the federal government as the Southern California region’s metropolitan planning organization and regional transportation planning agency. SCAG has sought to address regional planning concerns through various documents, including the 1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) and the CommunityLink21—2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update (2001 RTP Update).



Source: ©2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; City of Los Angeles; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-10.2: Community and District Plans

The RCPG “[i]s intended to serve the region as a framework for decision making with respect to the growth and changes that can be anticipated during the next 20 years and beyond.” In addition, the RCPG “describes how the Southern California region will meet certain federal and state requirements with respect to Transportation, Growth Management, Air Quality, Housing, Hazardous Waste Management, and Water Quality Management.”

The RCPG discusses regional growth and infrastructure issues in its Growth Management Chapter (GMC). The following policies in the GMC have been cited by SCAG staff as being potentially relevant to the proposed project:

- Policy 3.03: The timing, financing, and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region’s growth policies.
- Policy 3.09: Support local jurisdictions efforts to minimize cost of infrastructure and public service delivery, and efforts to seek new sources of funding for development and the provision of services.
- Policy 3.18: Encourage planned development in locations least likely to cause environmental impact.
- Policy 3.20: Support the protection of vital resources, such as wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, woodlands, production lands, and land containing unique and endangered plants and animals.
- Policy 3.21: Encourage the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites.
- Policy 3.22: Discourage development, or encourage the use of special design requirements, in areas with steep slopes, high fire, flood, and seismic hazards.
- Policy 3.23: Encourage mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards and minimize earthquake damage, and development of emergency response and recovery plans.
- Policy 3.27: Support local jurisdictions and other service providers in their efforts to develop sustainable communities and provide, equally to all members of society, accessible and effective services, such as public education, housing, health care, social services, recreational facilities, law enforcement, and fire protection.

The Air Quality Chapter of the RCPG sets policy contexts in which SCAG coordinates the efforts of counties and cities to meet the requirements of air plans within the region. The Air Quality Chapter core actions relevant to the proposed project are:

- Policy 5.07: Determine specific programs and associated actions needed (e.g., indirect source rules, enhanced use of telecommunications, provision of community based shuttle services,

provision of demand management based programs, or vehicle miles traveled–emission fees) so that options to command and control regulations can be assessed.

- Policy 5.11: Through the environmental document review process, ensure that plans at all levels of government (i.e., regional, air basin, county, subregional, and local) consider air quality, land use, transportation, and economic relationships to ensure consistency and minimize conflicts.

b. SCAG Regional Transportation Plan

The SCAG 2001 RTP Update serves as the primary transportation planning document for the Southern California region. It describes local and regional trends that affect the transportation system and recommends transportation investments to improve mobility and accessibility. SCAG staff has indicated that the following goals, objectives, policies, and/or actions in the 2001 RTP Update may be potentially relevant to the proposed project:

- Policy 4.01: Transportation investments shall be based on SCAG’s adopted regional performance indicators (i.e., mobility, accessibility, environment, reliability, safety, equity/environmental justice, and cost-effectiveness).
- Policy 4.02: Transportation investments shall mitigate environmental impacts to an acceptable level.
- Policy 4.03: Major investment studies or other major planning studies for regional transportation facilities shall include consideration of freight movement.
- Policy 4.04: Transportation control measures included in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) shall be a priority.
- Policy 4.16: Maintaining and operating the existing transportation system will be a priority over expanding capacity.
- Rail Grade Crossings: Construct grade separations where streets and highways cross regional rail lines. Study the funding mechanisms for grade crossing improvement projects to meet the needs of the entire region.

c. City of Los Angeles General Plan

The City of Los Angeles General Plan (General Plan) was adopted in 1974 and serves as a guide for the development decisions within the city. The General Plan consists of 12 elements. There are 11 current and pending citywide elements, including: the Framework Element (2001), the Transportation Element (1999), the Infrastructure Systems Element (pending initiation), the Public Facilities and Services Element (in progress), the Housing Element (2001), the Noise Element (1999), the Air Quality Element (1992), the Conservation Element (2001), the Open Space Element (pending initiation), the Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Element (pending initiation), and the Safety Element (1996). The last element of the General Plan, the

Land Use Element, is divided into 35 local community plans. The Framework Element and the Land Use Element are summarized below.

Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element

The General Plan Framework Element was adopted in 1996 as “a strategy for dealing with long-term growth.” The primary goal of the Framework Element “is to establish citywide planning policies regarding land use, housing, transportation, and the future of public services.” The Framework Element lays out the broad overall policy and direction for the entire General Plan and defines citywide policies that will be implemented through subsequent adoption of, and revisions to, the citywide elements, the 35 Community Plans, the zoning ordinances, and other pertinent planning programs.

The land use chapter of the Framework Element designates the proposed project area as part of a “Regional Center” and “Downtown Center.” Regional centers are intended to “serve as a focal point of regional commerce, identity, and activity.” They “provide a significant number of jobs and many non-work destinations that generate and attract a high number of vehicular trips. Consequently, each center shall function as a hub of regional bus or rail transit both day and night.” Among the land use policy provisions applicable to regional centers is Policy 3.10.2—“Accommodate and encourage the development of multi-modal transportation centers, where appropriate.”

The Downtown Center designation in the Framework Element is intended to maintain downtown Los Angeles as “the largest government center in the region and the location for major cultural and entertainment facilities, hotels, high-rise residential towers, regional transportation facilities....” In addition, the Framework Element states that the downtown center “will continue to ... function as the principal transportation hub for the region.” Objective 3.11 for the downtown center is to “provide for the continuation and expansion of government, business, cultural, entertainment, visitor-serving, housing, industries, transportation, supporting uses, and similar functions at a scale and intensity that distinguishes and uniquely identifies the Downtown Center.”

The land use chapter of the Framework Element also prescribes certain development goals for transit stations. Objective 3.15 recommends that planners “focus mixed commercial/residential uses, neighborhood-oriented retail, employment opportunities, and civic and quasi-public uses around urban transit stations, while protecting and preserving surrounding low-density neighborhoods from the encroachment of incompatible land uses.”

The transportation chapter of the Framework Element addresses citywide transportation issues relevant to the proposed project. For instance, it is noted in the Framework Element that “citywide transportation facilities and related policies should capitalize on existing and currently committed infrastructure (e.g., the highway and freeway system, High Occupancy Vehicle lanes, the Alameda Corridor, Metrorail, Metrolink, LAX, the Port of Los Angeles, *and Union Station* [emphasis added]).” It is also stated that “rail and bus transit improvement, transportation system management, and behavioral change (trip reduction and mode shift) strategies will all be needed to fulfill the transportation vision of the General Plan Framework Element. These strategies require significant investments in rail and bus transit.”

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element of the General Plan consists of 35 local community plans. Each of these plans provides detailed and focused planning goals and policies for their respective community planning areas.

The proposed project would be located in the Central City North Community Plan area and adjacent to the Central City Community Plan area.

Central City North Community Plan

The Central City North Community Plan was adopted in December 2000 and encompasses approximately 2,005 acres in the northern part of downtown Los Angeles. The jurisdictional boundaries of this planning area are from Alameda Street on the west to the Los Angeles River on the east, and from Broadway and Stadium Way on the north, to the City of Vernon boundary on the south. The Central City North Community Plan area contains large industrial and commercial operations within its boundaries, in addition to scattered residential land uses. The proposed project site is designated as a Regional Center within the Alameda District Plan (see below), with most of the plan area intended for industrial, commercial, and public facility uses. Although the plan does not specifically address the proposed project, it includes the following policies potentially relevant to the proposed project:

- Encourage the improvement of this area to serve as a strong commercial and industrial base and
- Encourage the expansion of public transit in an effort to provide alternatives to the private automobile for the public transit dependent.

Central City Community Plan

The Central City Community Plan, adopted in May 1974 and currently being revised, covers the central core of downtown Los Angeles. This 2,161-acre area extends from Sunset Boulevard on the north to the Santa Monica Freeway (Interstate Route 10) on the south, and from the Harbor Freeway (Interstate Route 110) on the west to Alameda Street on the east. The proposed project is located adjacent to the east boundary of the Central City Community Plan area along Alameda Street. Land use policies in this plan do not discuss the proposed project, but do encourage rail transit improvements generally.

Alameda District Specific Plan

The Alameda District Specific Plan (ADP) was adopted in June 1996. The ADP plan area is bounded by Alameda Street, North Main Street, Vignes Street, the Santa Ana Freeway, the El Monte Busway, and the passenger and platform areas within Union Station. The ADP is “approximately 70 acres in size and consists of two components: the 52-acre Los Angeles Union Station property and the 18-acre United States Postal Terminal Annex property.” Among the primary purposes of the ADP is to “provide continued and expanded development of the site as a

major transit hub for the region...” Permitted uses in the plan area include transit stations and related facilities and uses, outdoor eating areas, helipads, and outdoor retail uses.

The ADP is largely focused on commercial development in the vicinity of Union Station and does not discuss the proposed project. The ADP does, however, state that project applicants in this area “shall preserve and rehabilitate the significant historic elements of the Terminal Annex and Union Station buildings, except for those portions of the Union Station building known as the ‘altered southern service wing,’ the ‘south ramp,’ and the ‘1960s addition to the Terminal Annex building.” The ADP also declares that “if required by the Los Angeles Administrative or Municipal Code, review by the Cultural Heritage Commission shall occur prior to the issuance of any building or demolition permits for other significant portions of Union Station.”

d. City of Los Angeles Redevelopment Plans


The city’s Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) is responsible for eliminating blight in various redevelopment areas or projects in the city. The land use plans and policies for the redevelopment project areas are contained in each redevelopment plan (see Figure 3-10.3.). Descriptions of the redevelopment plans in the vicinity of the proposed project are provided below.

Little Tokyo Redevelopment Plan

The Little Tokyo Redevelopment Plan, adopted by CRA and Los Angeles City Council in 1970, and amended on June 2002, is comprised of the area of downtown Los Angeles from 1st Street to 3rd Street, and from Los Angeles Street to Alameda Street. Although the proposed project is not within the Little Tokyo Redevelopment Plan area, it is situated immediately to the east. The portion of this plan located immediately adjacent to the proposed project consists of mixed commercial, residential, and industrial uses, and is designated as such. The primary purpose of the plan is “to reconstruct and preserve a mixed use, full service community that will continue to serve as the cultural, religious, social, and commercial center of the Japanese American community in Southern California.” The redevelopment plan does not identify the proposed project.

Central Business District Redevelopment Plan

The Central Business District Redevelopment Plan, adopted by CRA and the Los Angeles City Council in 1975, encompasses the majority of central downtown Los Angeles, an area of approximately 1,549 acres. The redevelopment plan area generally extends from the Hollywood Freeway on the north to Interstate Route 10 on the south, and from Interstate Route 110 on the west to Alameda Street on the east. The proposed project area borders the redevelopment plan area along Alameda Street. One of the purposes of this redevelopment plan is “to assist in the development of downtown Los Angeles as a major center in the Los Angeles metropolitan region.” In addition, the plan supports “an integrated transportation system which will allow for efficient movement of people and goods while enhancing the environment...” The redevelopment plan does not identify the proposed project.



Source: ©2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002;1999, City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-10.3: CRA Redevelopment Areas

Chinatown Redevelopment Plan

The Chinatown Redevelopment Plan, adopted by CRA and the Los Angeles City Council in 1980, was created to “stimulate and maintain the area’s prominence as a focal point of commerce and culture for the Chinese population of Southern California.” The Chinatown Redevelopment Project covers 303 acres and is bounded by Interstate Route 110 on the north, North Broadway and North Main Street on the east, Santa Ana Freeway (Interstate Route 5) and Cesar Chavez Avenue on the south, and Beaudry Avenue on the west. The proposed project borders this redevelopment plan area along Alameda Street and North Main Street. The redevelopment plan does not identify the proposed project, but it is supportive of “the expansion and improvement of public transportation services” in the area.

Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Plan

The Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Plan was adopted on March 24, 1999, and is approximately 2,200 acres. Boundaries of this redevelopment plan area are irregularly shaped, and include the Los Angeles River to the west, Valley Boulevard to the north, Washington Boulevard to the south, and various roads as the eastern boundary. The redevelopment plan area is located east of the proposed project area, along the eastern side of the Los Angeles River. The redevelopment plan does not identify the proposed project.

Central Industrial Redevelopment Plan

The Central Industrial Redevelopment Plan was adopted in November 2002 and is bounded by 4th Street on the north, the Los Angeles River on the east, Washington Boulevard and Interstate Route 10 on the south, and Stanford Avenue and San Pedro Street on the west. The redevelopment area covers 744 acres. The redevelopment plan area is located south of the proposed project area, with the northern boundaries on 4th Street between San Pedro Street and the Los Angeles River. The predominant land use is industrial, with scattered pockets of commercial and residential uses. The redevelopment plan does not identify the proposed project.

3-10.2 Environmental Impacts

3-10.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The following impact analysis assesses how the proposed project would potentially affect the existing and planned land use pattern and overall development character of the study area.

The principle of sovereignty precludes the state and federal governments from seeking most local land use planning and zoning approvals. This concept has been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court (see *Mayo v. United States*, 319 U.S. 441 [1943]), the California Attorney General, and the California Supreme Court. Relying on the holding of the California Supreme Court in *Hall v. City of Taft*, 47 Cal.2d 177, 183 (1956), the California Attorney General has opined that “it is accepted as a general matter that neither the State nor its agencies is subject to local building or zoning regulations unless the Legislature consents to such regulation” (71 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 332,335 [1988]). The state, therefore, when engaging in sovereign activities such as the construction and maintenance of its buildings, is exempt from the planning and zoning regulations of the City of Los Angeles.

Although federal and state sovereignty may limit opportunities to follow local land use requirements, the project proponents recognize the importance to the community of the local planning and development process. Thus, in an effort to provide information about the proposed project to the community, the following provides a discussion of project compatibility with surrounding land uses and consistency with applicable planning and zoning.

3-10.2.2 Impact Criteria

The proposed project would result in an adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impact if:

- It would result in substantial short- or long-term land use conflicts that are not compatible with the existing land use pattern and rate of development in the study area.
- It would result in permanent acquisition and displacement of existing uses so substantial in number or type as to disrupt the existing land use pattern and rate of development in the study area.
- It would not be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.
- It would result in substantial unplanned development.

3-10.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Because the No Build Alternative involves no station or run-through tracks improvements, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would result. With the exception of the Eastside LRT Project, other transportation projects in the area are not expected to have substantial land use impacts. The Eastside LRT Project station at 1st Street could encourage development of the adjacent vacant parcel recently acquired by the City of Los Angeles.

b. Alternative A

Indirect Effects of Construction Activity

As detailed in the description of the proposed project Alternatives in Chapter 2, construction of this Alternative is expected to last up to 2 years. Construction activities would include demolition of one existing structure, displacement of several parking lot businesses, ground excavation and drilling, and construction of new facilities. These types of construction activities would result in some temporary, localized, site-specific disruptions to land uses in the project area primarily related to: construction-related traffic changes from trucks and equipment in the area; partial and/or complete street and lane closures, with some requiring detours; access disruptions to residences, businesses, and parking; and temporary increases in noise and vibration.

Residential land uses and other sensitive uses, such as schools, churches, parks, hotels, and hospitals, would be most susceptible to the foregoing temporary construction impacts. Generally, however, these are not considered to be significant adverse impacts because they are short term in nature and are commonly experienced in a dense urban setting like the proposed project area.

There are few sensitive land uses in proximity to any likely construction activity locations in the proposed project area. Residential uses are limited to the 400-unit William Mead Housing Project north of Union Station and a live-work loft building in the 100 block of Center Street, adjacent to the 1st Street Bridge. In both instances, the distance between the proposed project improvements and the nearest residential unit is sufficient to ensure that no indirect disruption would occur. Consequently, no significant (under CEQA)/adverse (under NEPA) effects are expected.

The following sections of this document provide more detailed information on these types of potential construction impacts, if any, as they may indirectly affect land uses in the proposed project area: 3-1 Acquisitions and Displacements; 3-2 Air Quality; 3-4 Community Facilities and Services; 3-11 Noise and Vibration; 3-14 Population, Housing, and Employment; 3-15 Traffic and Transportation; 3-16 Utilities; and 3-17 Visual.

Property Acquisition

In addition to the aforementioned indirect effects of construction activity on land use and planning, property acquisitions associated with construction of the proposed project could also affect land use and planning in the area. (Note: More detailed analysis of property acquisitions is provided in Section 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements.)

Under Alternative A, four privately owned parcels would be fully and permanently acquired and any structures on those parcels would be demolished. Three commercial uses (one warehouse and two surface parking lots) would be displaced by these property acquisitions. The fourth parcel is currently vacant. No residential uses would be affected.

The property acquisitions associated with Alternative A would have a less-than-significant impact on land use and planning in the proposed project study area. First, the number of acquisitions and related displacement of commercial uses is not so substantial as to materially affect the distribution or character of existing and planned land uses. Uses of the type and size that would be affected are found throughout the study area and the greater downtown, and can be expected to relocate without disruption to the overall pattern of land uses. Second, the effects of the property acquisitions, though adverse in the short term to the affected property owners, businesses, and employees, would largely be minimized by means of government relocation assistance programs. This assistance typically includes financial compensation and advisory services to help eligible displaced persons and businesses relocate.

c. Alternative A-1

Indirect Effects of Construction Activity

The indirect effects of construction activity under Alternative A-1 would be essentially the same as those described above for Alternative A.

Property Acquisition

Under Alternative A-1, three privately owned parcels would be fully and permanently acquired and any structures on those parcels would be demolished. Two commercial uses (one industrial

use and one surface parking lot) would be displaced by these property acquisitions. The third parcel is currently vacant. No residential uses would be affected.

For the same reasons discussed above for Alternative A, the property acquisitions associated with Alternative A-1 would have a less-than-significant impact on land use and planning in the proposed project study area.

3-10.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative involves no station or rail improvements that would affect land use in the long term. Other transportation projects may affect long-term land use due to the introduction of new or improved transit service and improved street capacity.

b. Alternatives A and A-1

Compatibility with Existing Land Uses

The proposed project would be located in an urbanized area with substantial commercial, industrial, and public facility development, as well as a sizable existing rail and freeway network. Sensitive land uses (i.e., residences, schools, hospitals, or places of worship) are either not present in the study area or are distant from the proposed project alignment. Given this existing pattern of development, where significant rail transportation infrastructure is already present and nearly all nearby land uses are of a type not considered sensitive to this kind of proposed project, the likelihood of land use conflicts is very minimal. Consequently, the proposed project would be compatible with the existing land use pattern and rate of development in the study area. No adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would result.

Consistency with Land Use Plans

As described above in Section 3-10.1.2, the land use plans and policies applicable to the study area do not explicitly address the proposed project. Nonetheless, to the extent that some plans do discuss transportation infrastructure and rail transit, the consistency of the proposed project with these plans can be generally assessed. Table 3-11.1, below, summarizes the consistency of the proposed project with the applicable land use plans and policies. In every case, the proposed project would be consistent. Thus, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts would result.

Table 3-10.1: Project Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

| Plan/Policy | Project Consistent With Plan/Policy? | Remarks |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan & Guide—Growth Management Chapter (GMC) and Air Quality Chapter (AQC) | | |
| GMC Policy 3.03: The timing, financing, and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region's growth policies. | Neutral | Policy is to be implemented by SCAG. |
| GMC Policy 3.09: Support local jurisdiction's efforts to minimize cost of infrastructure and public service delivery, and efforts to seek new sources of funding for development and the provision of services | Neutral | Policy is to be implemented by SCAG. |
| GMC Policy 3.18: Encourage planned development in locations least likely to cause environmental impact. | Yes | Project would be constructed in an urbanized, primarily industrial area. |
| GMC Policy 3.20: Support the protection of vital resources, such as wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, woodlands, production lands, and land containing unique and endangered species. | Yes | Project would not be located in area with any sensitive natural resources. See Section 3-3 of this document. |
| GMC Policy 3.21: Encourage the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites. | Yes | Project would, if necessary, include measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on cultural resources. See Section 3-5 of this document. |
| GMC Policy 3.22: Discourage development, or encourage the use of special design requirements, in areas with steep slopes, high fire, flood, and seismic hazards. | Yes | Project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable safety and design standards. |

Table 3-10.1: Project Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

| Plan/Policy | Project Consistent With Plan/Policy? | Remarks |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p>GMC Policy 3.23: Encourage mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards, minimize earthquake damage, and to develop emergency response and recovery plans.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>This environmental document has identified mitigation measures where necessary to address adverse effects of the project.</p> |
| <p>GMC Policy 3.27: Support local jurisdictions and other service providers in their efforts to develop sustainable communities and provide, equally to all members of society, accessible and effective services such as: public education, housing, health care, social services, recreational facilities, law enforcement, and fire protection.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>Project would provide improved rail transportation service to all members of the Southern California community.</p> |
| <p>AQC Policy 5.07: Determine specific programs and associated actions needed (e.g., indirect source rules, enhanced use of telecommunications, provision of community-based shuttle services, provision of demand management based programs, or vehicle miles traveled–emission fees) so that options to command and control regulations can be assessed.</p> | <p>Neutral</p> | <p>Policy is not relevant to the proposed project.</p> |
| <p>AQC Policy 5.11: Through the environmental document review process, ensure that plans at all levels of government consider air quality, land use, transportation, and economic relationships to ensure consistency and minimize conflicts.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>This environmental document has addressed consistency of the project with applicable plans and policies.</p> |

Table 3-10.1: Project Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

| Plan/Policy | Project Consistent With Plan/Policy? | Remarks |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| SCAG Regional Transportation Plan 2001 Update (RTP) | | |
| RTP Policy 4.01: Transportation investments shall be based on SCAG's adopted regional performance indicators (i.e., mobility, accessibility, environment, reliability, safety, equity/environmental justice, and cost-effectiveness). | Neutral | Policy to be implemented by SCAG. |
| RTP Policy 4.02: Transportation investments shall mitigate environmental impacts to an acceptable level. | Yes | This environmental document has identified mitigation measures where necessary to address adverse effects of the project. |
| RTP Policy 4.03: Major investment studies or other major planning studies for regional transportation facilities shall include consideration of freight movement. | Yes | This environmental document discusses the relationship between this project and rail freight movement in Sections 3-12 and 3-15. |
| RTP Policy 4.04: Transportation control measures included in the state implementation plan shall be a priority. | Neutral | Policy is not relevant to this project. |
| RTP Policy 4.16: Maintaining and operating the existing transportation system will be a priority over expanding capacity. | Yes | Proposed project would improve an existing transportation facility in order to meet planned levels of regional rail transit growth. |
| RTP Policy (Rail Grade Crossings): Construct grade separations where streets and highways cross regional rail lines. Study the funding mechanisms for grade crossing improvement projects to meet the needs of the entire region. | Yes | Proposed project includes a grade-separated viaduct in order to avoid conflicts with streets and highways. |

Table 3-10.1: Project Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

| Plan/Policy | Project Consistent With Plan/Policy? | Remarks |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element, Policy 3.10.2: Accommodate and encourage the development of multimodal transportation centers, where appropriate. Framework Element, Objective 3.11: Provide for the continuation and expansion of government, business, cultural, entertainment, visitor-serving, housing, industries, transportation, supporting uses, and similar functions at a scale and intensity that distinguishes and uniquely identifies the downtown center.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>Proposed project would improve the existing multimodal transportation hub at Union Station.</p> |
| <p>Framework Element, Objective 3.15: Focus mixed commercial/residential uses, neighborhood-oriented retail, employment opportunities, and civic and quasi-public uses around urban transit stations, while protecting and preserving surrounding low-density neighborhoods from the encroachment of incompatible land uses.</p> | <p>Neutral</p> | <p>Land use planning decisions in the project area are dependent upon City of Los Angeles actions.</p> |
| <p>Framework Element, Transportation Chapter: Citywide transportation facilities and related policies should capitalize on existing and currently committed infrastructure (e.g., Union Station).</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>Proposed project would improve the existing Union Station facility and rail network.</p> |
| <p>Central City North Community Plan: Encourage the improvement of this area to serve as a strong commercial and industrial base.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>The proposed project would not interfere with the existing and planned industrial/commercial character of this area.</p> |
| <p>Central City North Community Plan: Encourage the expansion of public transit in an effort to provide alternatives to the private</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>The proposed project would improve rail transit service in this area.</p> |

Table 3-10.1: Project Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

| Plan/Policy | Project Consistent With Plan/Policy? | Remarks |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| automobile for the public transit dependent. | | |
| Central City Community Plan | Neutral | No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project. |
| Alameda District Specific Plan: Provide continued and expanded development of the site as a major transit hub for the region. | Yes | Proposed project would improve the existing multimodal transportation hub at Union Station. |
| City of Los Angeles Redevelopment Plans | | |
| Little Tokyo | Neutral | No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project. |
| Central Business District | Neutral | No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project. |
| Chinatown | Neutral | No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project. |
| Adelante Eastside | Neutral | No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project. |
| Central Industrial | Neutral | No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project. |

Induced Development

Because the proposed project may result in surplus property (e.g., vacant land remaining beneath the elevated viaduct structure), there could exist some potential for future new development to occur. It is assumed that all of this surplus property would be owned by MTA, and could potentially be offered for sale or lease to other entities. The probability and scope of effects of any future development on this land cannot be specifically assessed given the other factors that affect land development, such as planning and zoning regulations, policy considerations, and market conditions. Generally, however, there is evidence in the current land use plans for this area that any potential new development would be consistent with the existing commercial and industrial development. Future development, if it were to proceed in accordance with currently adopted plans and policies, would likely be infill projects not unlike the surrounding uses. Accordingly, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts from this potential new land development are reasonably foreseeable at this time.

3-10.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Taking into consideration the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development projects in the study area, it would be unlikely that the proposed project and those other projects would result in adverse cumulative impacts. First, any other related projects would be held to the same regional and local land use plans and policies as the proposed project, thereby ensuring consistency with those land use regulations. Second, no other related projects have been identified that would conflict with either the proposed project or the existing and planned land use and development pattern in the study area. Finally, the other related projects in the study, in conjunction with the proposed project, are unlikely to cumulatively induce additional land development beyond that which is already planned. The study area includes a limited amount of developable land, and many other considerations, such as land use regulations and market conditions, would have to be present for development to occur. As a result, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts are anticipated.

3-10.3 Mitigation

Because no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) impacts to land use and planning are expected to result from the proposed project, no mitigation is necessary.

3-9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

3-9.1 Existing Conditions

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) and Initial Site Assessment (ISA), which includes a database search and site survey for evidence of recognized environmental conditions, were prepared in June 2003 for both Alternative A and Alternative A-1. These reports can be found in Appendix E.

All Phase I ESA work was conducted in general accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice for Phase I Environmental Site Assessments E 1527-00. The ASTM E 1527-00 document outlines a procedure for completing Phase I ESAs that includes a review of records, site reconnaissance, and interviews where possible.

The assessment included the following components:

- a walkthrough of the subject property and all adjoining areas within 305 meters (1,000 feet) of the proposed construction corridor,
- a review of pertinent records for evidence of historical and present use of the subject and adjoining properties,
- interviews where attainable with local government officials, and
- evaluation of information gathered.

This assessment did not include sampling or analysis of soil, groundwater, or other materials.

In addition, an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) Checklist was completed for the project according to Appendix DD of the Department Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM). The purpose of the ISA Checklist is to screen and assess a defined target area around and including the proposed project site for potential hazardous waste involvement.

Based upon the physical site inspection, most properties within or immediately adjoining the proposed project footprint do not appear to present a potential environmental risk to the proposed project. There were no indicators or visual evidence of contaminated soil, spills, leaks, surface staining, oil sheen, vegetation damage, odors, hazardous materials containing asbestos, or lead-based paint except as noted below and further described within this report:

- underground storage tanks;
- aboveground silos;
- power transmission lines;
- streetlight fixtures;

- one industrial building (the Friedman Bag Company Building at 711 Ducommun), possibly storing chemicals within the project footprint;
- chemical storage of up to one hundred 208-liter (55-gallon) drums within a fenced lot located south of the East Commercial Street cul-de-sac. Signs identify the site as a City of Los Angeles hazardous waste storage facility (within the project footprint);
- twenty-five unidentified 208-liter (55-gallon) drums located at the northwest corner of Commercial Street and South Vignes Street at the U.S. 101 eastbound entrance; and
- two unidentified 208-liter (55-gallon) drums located at southwest corner of Commercial Street and South Vignes Street.

In addition, there is an ongoing investigation at the Aliso Manufactured Gas Plant sites, in which two of the project areas are in close proximity to the proposed Alternatives A and A-1. One area, bordered by Commercial Street to the north, Center Street to the west, Ducommun Street to the south, and the BNSF tracks and Los Angeles River to the east, indicates that, based upon a Preliminary Endangerment Assessment, potential contamination with petroleum hydrocarbons is evident. This potential contamination affects the alignments of both Alternatives A and A-1. A “Remedial Action” plan is to be submitted to the DTSC within three months.

Finally, it was observed, and historical records substantiated, that some structures, which may be demolished to accommodate the elevated rail structure, are older buildings that may contain asbestos-contaminated materials (ACM) and/or lead-based paint (LBP). The Environmental Data Resources (EDR) report identified 68 sites within the specified search distances from the proposed alignments. A complete list and description of these sites is included in Appendix E. Most of the sites present no environmental concern to the alignments based on their permits with environmental regulatory agencies, “no further action” status, or distance, and are topographically down/cross gradient relative to the proposed alignments for the run-through tracks.

Of the total number of sites located within the search area, three properties were identified as being located directly within the proposed project alignment (shown in bold in Table 3-9.1). Additional properties in close proximity to the proposed track alignments were identified, which, by the nature of hazardous material issues evident onsite, may present hazardous material concerns to the proposed project, especially along the trestle segments nearest to Commercial Street. An overview of the database search results is shown in Table 3-9.1 and Figure 3-9.1. Table 3-9.2 presents a summary of the environmental risk distribution within the proposed project corridor and search area.


Table 3-9.1: Primary Database Listed Sites

| Business Name | Environmental Finding/Potential Project Impact | Address |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Southern California Gas Company | Listed site was listed as a VCP (Voluntary Cleanup Program) property and contains low-threat-level property with confirmed/unconfirmed releases. This site was used for gas manufacturing until 1946. The site now is fully paved, and there are no routes of exposure unless construction occurs. Expected contaminants include lampblack, tars, petroleum hydrocarbons, and possibly cyanide. Prior investigations associated with the active or proposed highway construction have indicated that contamination does exist in the area. Also, some cleanup work has occurred offsite under Vignes and Ramirez Streets. The site is still under research. | Keller Street, Vignes Street/ U.S. 101 |
| PBR Realty, LLC | Listed as LUST (Leaking Underground Storage Tank). The facility had a small gasoline leak reported in April 1993; it is unclear when the actual leak incident occurred. The site was tested for MTBE, which was detected. The listed site was not located during the site visit. Data search is still in process. | 531 E. Commercial Street |
| Southern California Gas Company | Southern California Gas Company maintains contaminated soil (not confirmed) at this site from previous site cleanups. Visit to the site (May 28, 2003) identified approximately 35 to 40 cubic yards of potentially contaminated soil at the site. The site is fenced and located on the west end of the block, bordered by N. Garey St., Commercial St., N. Hewitt St., and Ducommun St. | 516 E. Commercial Street |
| Property (owner not yet identified) | This site has two 15,141-liter (4,000-gallon) underground storage tanks (USTs). The underground storage tanks were utilized for storage of unleaded and regular gasoline; it is unknown if the tanks are still in use or empty. The area is a flat vacant lot (disturbed) with no vegetation, fenced, and bordered by N. Garey St., Commercial St., N. Hewitt St., and Ducommun St. This site is not within the proposed A or A-1 Alternatives, and the presence of the USTs should not affect construction. This site is still under research and waiting responses. | 510 E. Commercial Street |
| S & P Company | This site has an active underground storage tank and is under research and waiting responses. The site is also shared by the Department. An investigation/site assessment was conducted at the property (501 Commercial Street) for TPH (Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons). Records and or additional information is still pending and waiting inquiry responses. Potential soil contamination effects on construction are unknown pending additional inquiry. | 501 E. Commercial Street |
| Los Angeles Police Department | Two unidentified 208-liter (55-gallon) steel drums were located within the borders of this facility. Visual observation took place from Vignes Street. The Los Angeles Police Department generates and stores unspecified hazardous waste material at the facility. This site will likely not affect project construction. | 620 E. Commercial Street |

Table 3-9.1: Primary Database Listed Sites

| Business Name | Environmental Finding/Potential Project Impact | Address |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Friedman Bag Company | Listed as HAZNET (hazardous waste manifest tracking system). This is a small-quantity generator site with less than nine tons of RCRA and non-RCRA hazardous waste. The facility also maintains an inactive underground storage tank that previously stored gasoline. Also, due to structure age, potential asbestos and lead-based paint may require precautions during construction. This tank would have to be removed as part of Alternative A construction. | 801 E. Commercial Street |
| Southern California Gas/Aliso MGP | Listed as VCP properties (contain low-threat-level properties with confirmed/unconfirmed releases). This site is being investigated as part of a larger sector by DTSC for low levels (unconfirmed) of suspected contaminants, including petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, cyanide, and heavy metals. Some remedial work has been conducted. Construction of either alignment may be affected by work activities proposed for or near this site. Additional inquiry and evaluation is recommended to assess the need for and type of remedial measures planned. This site is still under research and waiting responses. | Center Street @ Commercial Street |
| Property (owner not yet identified) | Chemical storage of up to one hundred 208-liter (55-gallon) steel drums was visually identified within a fenced lot located south of the East Commercial Street cul-de-sac. Signs identify the site as a City of Los Angeles hazardous waste storage facility (within the project footprint). The fenced storage facility is bordered by Commercial Street on the north, Ducommun Street on the south, the BNSF railway on the east, and the Friedman Bag Company's (711 Ducommun) parking lot to the west. It is unclear the type of chemicals being stored or if the drums are empty. This site is in immediate proximity to the proposed elevated structures of Alternatives A and A-1. | 800 block E. Commercial Street cul-de-sac |
| Property (owner not yet identified) | Twenty-five unidentified 208-liter (55 gallon) steel drums located at the northwest corner of Commercial Street and South Vignes Street at the U.S. 101 eastbound entrance. It is unclear as to who is the current owner of the lot and or the steel drums. This site is located below the proposed railway bridge. | Parking lot @ northwest corner Commercial Street and South Vignes Street, @ U.S. 101 eastbound entrance |

Source: EDR, 2003.



Source: HDR, Inc., 2003.

Figure 3-9.1: Listed Sites of Concern

**Table 3-9.2: Environmental Risk Distribution Summary (Positive Hits)
Site Location: Los Angeles Union Station, Los Angeles, California 90012**

| Database | Database Description | Number of Sites | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | 0 to 1/16 mile | 1/16 to 1/8 mile | 1/8 to 3/16 mile |
| CERCLIS | Potentially hazardous waste site | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| CERC-NFRAP | CERCLIS sites designated “no further remedial action planned” | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| RCRIS LQG | Hazardous materials large-quantity generator | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| RCRIS SQG | Hazardous materials small-quantity generator | 2 | 5 | 13 |
| ERNS | Emergency Response Notification System (oil and hazardous substances) | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| AWP | Annual work plan sites—known hazardous substance sites targeted for cleanup | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CAL-SITES | Known and potential hazardous substance sites | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CHMIRS | California Hazardous Materials Incident Report System—hazardous materials incidents | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| CORTESE | Public drinking water wells with detectable contamination levels | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| LUST | Leaking Underground Storage Tanks inventory | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| UST | Underground storage tank (UST) registry | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| VCP | Voluntary cleanup program properties; contains low-threat-level properties with confirmed/unconfirmed releases | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| CA FID UST | Facility Inventory Database containing active/inactive underground storage tanks | 8 | 12 | 18 |
| HIST UST | Historical registered USTs | 4 | 6 | 11 |
| FINDS | Facility Index System with “pointers” to other information database sources | 3 | 8 | 16 |
| HMIRS | Hazardous materials information reporting system | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| FTTS | FIFRA/TSCA—administrative and pesticide enforcement actions tracking system | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| NFA | Sites listed as “no further action determination” | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| CA SLIC | California spills, leaks, investigation, and cleanup cost-recovery listing | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| HAZNET | Hazardous waste manifest tracking system | 14 | 15 | 22 |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY HMS | | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY SITE MITIGATION | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Coal Gas | Historical existence and location of coal gas sites | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Totals | | 58.94 | 78.94 | 113.94 |

Source: EDR, 2003.

3-9.1.1 Regulatory Setting

A hazardous material is defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), as a material that poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or the environment if released because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics (26 California Code of Regulations Section 25501). For the purposes of this analysis, hazardous materials include raw materials, and hazardous waste includes waste generated by facilities and businesses or waste material remaining onsite as a result of past activities. Applicable regulations and policies considered relevant to the proposed project and project alternatives are summarized below.

a. Federal Regulations

The principal federal regulatory agency responsible for the safe use and handling of hazardous materials is the EPA. Two key federal regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes are described below. Other applicable federal regulations are contained primarily in Titles 29, 40, and 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act enables EPA to administer a regulatory program that extends from the manufacture of hazardous materials to their disposal, thus regulating the generation, transport, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste at all facilities and sites in the nation.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, also known as Superfund, was passed to facilitate the cleanup of the nation's toxic waste sites. In 1986, Superfund was amended by the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act Title III (community right-to-know laws). Title III states that past and present owners of land contaminated with hazardous substances can be held liable for the entire cost of the cleanup, even if the material was dumped illegally when the property was under different ownership.

b. State Regulations

California regulations are equal to or more stringent than federal regulations. EPA has granted the State of California primary oversight responsibility to administer and enforce hazardous waste management programs. State regulations require planning and management to ensure that hazardous wastes are handled, stored, and disposed of properly to reduce risks to human health and the environment. Several key laws pertaining to hazardous wastes are discussed below.

Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations

In California, Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations addresses hazardous materials and wastes. The Hazardous Waste Control Law of 1972 is the seminal hazardous waste control law in California. The Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act) govern hazardous materials handling, reporting requirements, and local agency surveillance programs. Section 65962.5 of the Government Code directs the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to compile a list of all hazardous-waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.59 of the California Health and Safety Code.

Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act of 1985

The Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act, also known as the Business Plan Act, requires businesses using hazardous materials to prepare a plan that describes their facilities, inventories, emergency response plans, and training programs. Hazardous materials are defined as raw or unused materials that are part of a process or manufacturing step. They are not considered to be hazardous waste. Health concerns pertaining to the release of hazardous materials, however, are similar to those relating to hazardous waste.

Hazardous Waste Control Act

The Hazardous Waste Control Act created the state hazardous waste management program, which is similar to, but more stringent than, the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act program. The act is implemented by regulations contained in Title 26 of the California Code of Regulations, which describes the following required aspects for the proper management of hazardous waste:

- identification and classification;
- generation and transport;
- design and permitting of recycling, treatment, storage, and disposal facilities;
- treatment standards;
- operation of facilities and staff training; and
- closure of facilities and liability requirements.

These regulations list materials that may be hazardous and establish criteria for identifying, packaging, and disposing of them. Under the Hazardous Waste Control Act and Title 26, the generator of hazardous waste must complete a manifest that accompanies the waste from the generator to the transporter to the ultimate disposal location. Copies of the manifest must be filed with the DTSC.

Emergency Services Act

Under the Emergency Services Act, the State developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local agencies. Rapid response to incidents involving hazardous materials or hazardous waste is an important part of the plan, which is administered by the California Office of Emergency Services. The office coordinates the responses of other agencies, including EPA, the California Highway Patrol, regional water quality control boards, air quality management districts, and county disaster response offices.

Other Laws, Regulations, and Programs

Various other state regulations have been enacted based upon federal legislation that affect hazardous waste management, including:

- Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65), which requires labeling of substances known or suspected by the State to cause cancer.
- California Government Code Section 65962.5, which requires the Office of Permit Assistance to compile a list of possible contaminated sites in the State. State and federal regulations also require that hazardous materials sites be identified and listed in public records. The public records reviewed as part of this EIR/EIS are presented in Technical Appendix E, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Initial Site Assessment Checklist.
- The federal Underground Storage Tank (UST) law (40 CFR sec. 6991 et seq.) was adopted in 1984. In California, UST regulation is administered by three levels of agencies: state, regional, and local. Statewide standards for UST registration, construction, and operation are developed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The state board's nine subsidiary Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) are primarily responsible for determining cleanup procedures and standards for leaking USTs, although other local agencies may assume some of these responsibilities.

In 1989, California adopted the Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act (the AST Act [California Health & Safety Code sec. 25270 et seq.]). The AST Act requires facility registration, spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plans and, in certain cases, groundwater monitoring. The state board and regional boards implement these requirements.

c. Regional / Local Regulatory Requirements

Health Hazardous Materials Division

In May 1982, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors established the Hazardous Materials Control Program in the Department of Health Services. Originally, the program focused on the inspection of hazardous waste generating businesses but since has been expanded to include hazardous materials inspections, criminal investigations, site mitigation oversight, and emergency response operations.

In 1991, the program was transferred to the Los Angeles County Fire Department and its name changed to Health Hazardous Materials Division (HHMD). The HHMD mission is to protect the public health and the environment throughout Los Angeles County from accidental releases and improper handling, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes through coordinated efforts of inspections, emergency response, enforcement, and site mitigation oversight. The Hazardous Materials Specialists are environmental health professionals dedicated to preventing pollution by serving both the public and business communities in Los Angeles County.

The Los Angeles County Fire Department is a member of a Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), which conducts inspections of businesses, manages and reviews various hazardous waste permits for business plans, and oversees cleanups.

Los Angeles City Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

The Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program consolidates six hazardous materials and waste programs (Program Elements) under one agency, a CUPA. The Fire Department, as the CUPA, provides this oversight for the City of Los Angeles. In addition, the underground tank section provides field verification and inspections for underground tank permitting, leaks, and cleanup. The Fire Department also contracts with the HHMD Unit of Los Angeles County Fire Department, which oversees the program for businesses within the city.

3-9.2 Environmental Impacts

There are several ways in which a project can be affected by or cause impacts related to hazardous materials and waste. First, previously identified hazardous materials or wastes may lie within the path of construction at specified points in the project corridor, potentially exposing construction workers or the general public to impacts. These previously identified sites may include:

- contaminated soil, either from prior industrial activities, intentional dumping, or accidental spills or leaks;
- aboveground or underground storage tanks, pipes, reservoirs, etc., some of which may be leaking;
- debris or other aboveground or underground materials from an existing or previous land use, including active industrial operations or commercial establishments; or
- materials contained within structures scheduled for demolition (such as lead paint or asbestos).

Another source of potential impacts is encountering previously unidentified sites such as those listed above.

A third type of potential impacts relates to migration of hazardous materials or waste through soil and water. A project may place people in an area previously affected by migration from hazardous sites or may change the soil or drainage conditions in such a way that migration from hazardous sites is altered, impacting previously unaffected sites. This can expose people on the project site or in other areas to hazards.

During construction, some materials or by-products used in rail bed or elevated structures during construction may be hazardous. The use of these materials may result in impacts to the general public and to construction workers. During operation of the facility, hazardous materials typically associated with track line and equipment maintenance may also be used.

3-9.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Potential impacts from hazardous materials were evaluated in terms of direct effects associated with physical contact by the project with existing or historic activities. These activities were evaluated within the project site and immediate surrounding area and are believed or known to involve the use, discharge, or disposal of hazardous substances.

3-9.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. NEPA Significance Thresholds

NEPA requires analysis and a detailed statement of the environmental impact of any proposed federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The FRA requires that the EIS assess the transportation or use of any hazardous materials that may be used in conjunction with the proposed alternatives and the level of protection afforded residents of the affected environment from construction-period and long-term operations associated with the alternatives.

b. CEQA Significance Thresholds

According to State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would result in significant hazardous materials impacts if it:

- creates a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- creates a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- involves a substantial risk of an explosion in the event of an accident or otherwise adversely affects overall public safety;

- is located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or
- emits hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances of waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

3-9.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative assumes that no improvements would be made at Los Angeles Union Station and no additional track or structures would be constructed. There would be no hazardous materials/wastes mitigation as a result of the project, and existing sites would remain as summarized in this section and detailed in the Phase I report. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative is assumed to have no construction- or post-construction-phase hazardous materials/wastes impacts. Other transportation projects in the area have the potential to encounter and disturb hazardous materials. It is assumed that each project has addressed hazardous materials in its environmental documents and that appropriate mitigation measures have been developed for construction of those projects.

b. Alternative A

Potential impacts associated with the use of hazardous materials onsite are described below. The following are potential hazards that construction workers and/or the public could be exposed to in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project, based upon the results of the Phase I ESA and related hazardous materials and substance issues known to occur within the project area:

- encounters with hazardous materials/sites during construction,
- safety impacts for construction workers and third parties,
- aboveground and underground storage tank removal,
- unidentified hazardous materials, or
- asbestos-contaminated materials and lead-based paint from building demolition and removal activities.

Impacts of either Alternative A or A-1 would be not adverse (under NEPA) and less than significant (under CEQA) with appropriate mitigation for CEQA Criteria numbers 1, 2, 3, and 5. The proposed alternatives would result in impacts that are potentially adverse (under NEPA) and potentially significant (under CEQA) unless appropriate mitigation is implemented for CEQA Criterion 4.

The sites identified in Section 3-9.1, which include buildings, structures, hazardous materials storage areas, and former manufacturing complexes, are located within or near the footprint of the proposed A and A-1 alignments. Two locations with hazardous waste drums are located within the proposed A and A-1 alignments. Also, the Aliso Manufactured Gas Plant site blocks currently under investigation would affect construction in the trestle segments of either alternative. Based upon site histories, records, and interviews with persons knowledgeable with about sites, hazardous material may be encountered during construction based on the proximity of both alignments to identified sites, types of activities, and/or historical environmental conditions.

In addition to known or historic contamination sites, there may also be hazardous materials used in the construction of Alternative A. Because this alternative includes construction of additional rail transport tracks, service tracks, a bridge, and an aerial roadway structure, a number of materials that may be hazardous may be used. These materials may include drilling and paving materials, chemicals, oils, lubricants, and paints; removal and replacement of creosote-treated railroad ties may be necessary as well.

It is anticipated that during construction, for all project segments, fuels and lubricants used for construction equipment would be contained in accordance with appropriate local and state hazardous materials requirements, permits, and general best practices standards. No disposal of hazardous materials should occur onsite, thus reducing impacts to less than significant. Equipment maintenance that would result in the production of used engine oil and lubricants would be managed in a way that allows for offsite disposal at a facility designed for that purpose.

The construction process may also include the excavation and transport of hazardous materials. Any such materials would be properly stored, handled, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable hazardous waste management plans and laws.

c. Alternative A-1

Construction of Alternative A-1 would result in short-term impacts similar to Alternative A except that demolition of the Friedman Building at 801 Commercial Street would result in hazardous material impacts related to presumed asbestos contamination and other hazardous materials management issues that exist at the property that were identified through data sources. Prior to demolition, onsite investigations would be made to identify any specific hazardous materials. A plan to handle and dispose of such materials would be developed and implemented.

3-9.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative assumes that no additional hazardous materials/wastes impacts would be generated by the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative is assumed to have no long-term hazardous materials/wastes impacts. Other transportation projects in the area have the potential to encounter and disturb hazardous materials. It is assumed that each project has addressed hazardous materials in its environmental

documents and that appropriate mitigation measures have been developed for construction of those projects.

b. Alternative A

The alternative would result in the removal of any hazardous materials that may occur at 801 Commercial Street. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would substantially increase the use of hazardous materials and would likely have a less-than-significant impact. Increased train use would increase the potential for incidental releases of oils, greases, and related by-products within the proposed alignment. The proposed physical structure improvements to capture non-storm-related discharges of hazardous materials (as defined under NPDES and related local hazardous materials management regulatory requirements) would reduce the likelihood of uncontrolled spills or releases to the environment.

c. Alternative A-1

Construction of Alternative A-1 would result in similar operational impacts to those in Alternative A. This alternative would not include demolition of 801 Commercial Street, so any hazardous materials that exist at that property would continue.

3-9.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

Potential hazardous materials sites have been identified within 305 meters (1,000 feet) of proposed improvements. Construction of either alternative would not affect locations other than those specifically identified in this section. Potential impacts associated with the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project would not combine with other potentially hazardous conditions to result in a cumulative impact, since each individual project would be implemented to include provisions for remediation to less-than-significant levels of any encountered contaminants.

3-9.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period

Alternative A

No adverse (under NEPA) or less-than-significant (under CEQA) impacts relative to hazardous materials issues would occur associated with construction of Alternative A, since all regulatory requirements would be implemented. Based upon historical, recognized environmental conditions on the project site, appropriate consultations with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department, DTSC, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and compliance with stipulated local and state regulations and regulated and/or permitted construction requirements, impacts resulting from removal of hazardous materials during construction would be minimized.

Any amount of contaminated soil and potential petroleum concentrations associated with existing railroad track base; pre-existing, historic area contamination; or other unknown

contamination sources would be assessed prior to actual construction. In this regard, any construction contract documents associated with the proposed segments would need to contain provisions for the following:

Given the nature of the sites identified in the ISA and ESA, Phase II investigations of the drum storage areas and concurrent evaluation of the Aliso MGP site could be completed prior to acquisition of the properties. Because there are properties that are not subject to acquisition that are potential contamination sources that could affect the project, Phase II site investigation work would be required within the project's right-of-way limits to evaluate potential impacts to the project from these offsite sources. In addition, it may be appropriate to perform some level of systematic groundwater sampling within areas where groundwater could be encountered during construction. Such sampling may be performed in conjunction with other Phase II efforts. Given the information reported in the ISA and Phase I ESA, and the nature of soil conditions associated with railroad operations, soil samples would be collected, tested, and analyzed for residual heavy metals and total petroleum hydrocarbons.

It is assumed that a Health and Safety Plan would be developed to guide all construction activities. The Health and Safety Plan would meet the requirements of 29 CFR 1910 and all other applicable federal, state, and local regulations and requirements. A certified industrial hygienist would prepare the plan based on evaluations of the proposed construction activities and the potential hazards identified in the ISA. The plan would contain specific procedures for encountering both expected and unexpected contaminants. The plan would prescribe safe work practices, contaminant monitoring, personal protective equipment, emergency response procedures, and safety training requirements for the protection of construction workers and third parties.

Often, old abandoned tanks that are not registered can be present within the project limits. Therefore, the contractor must be prepared to encounter these types of tanks during construction, as discussed in the next mitigation measure. Removal of aboveground and underground storage tanks within the proposed project corridor, if present, would also be required by the Los Angeles City Fire Department. All procedures for removing tanks, including sampling procedures, would be in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

Before construction begins, as part of the Health and Safety Plan, contingency measures would be in place to address events such as the discovery of unidentified underground storage tanks, hazardous materials, petroleum hydrocarbons, or hazardous or solid wastes during construction. This contingency plan would address underground storage tank decommissioning, field screening and material testing methods, mitigation and contaminant management requirements, and health and safety requirements for construction workers. If an unexpected release of hazardous substances is found in reportable quantities, the National Response Center must be notified and the cleanup coordinated with environmental agencies.

Potential exposure of construction workers to asbestos-contaminated materials (ACM) would be minimized through disclosure of the potential presence of ACMs during demolition and renovation of structures that were constructed prior to 1979. Asbestos sampling surveys would be conducted on any building material prior to demolition or renovation. Before demolition or

renovation of buildings or structures that were constructed prior to 1979, the project contractor would prepare an Operations and Maintenance Plan that meets all applicable federal, state, and local requirements. This plan would address methods for safely maintaining the ACMs that are to be left in place at the project site. Removal, transport, and disposal of any ACMs would be undertaken in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulation.

Potential exposure of construction workers to lead-based paint (LBP) would be minimized through disclosure of the potential presence of LBP during demolition and renovation of structures located within the proposed alignment that were constructed prior to 1979. Before demolition or renovation of any painted surfaces at the project site, a LBP survey would be conducted by the contractor to determine the level of risk posed to construction personnel from exposure to the paints present at the site. Any recommendations made in that survey related to the paints present at the project site would be implemented prior to the demolition or renovation of said painted surfaces. Removal, transport, and disposal of any LBP would be undertaken in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulation.

A soils and groundwater contaminant management plan would be implemented during construction. The plan would include procedures for contaminant monitoring and identification, temporary storage, handling, treatment, and disposal of materials in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations and requirements. Potential exposure of construction workers to contaminants in soils or groundwater during grading and construction of the elevated structure and track extensions would be minimized through the requirement to test for contaminants and establish and implement a remediation plan as part of the proposed construction.

Groundwater sampling surveys for contaminants in concentrations above accepted state and federal regulatory levels would be conducted prior to the commencement of pylon, abutment, and other intrusive construction activities that would be expected to contact ground water. If contaminated soils or groundwater are found to be present in the proposed construction areas, the contractor would complete remediation or treatment prior to construction. The Department and Amtrak would be responsible for notifying all construction contractors undertaking activities below affected grades of the potential for exposure to contaminated soils and groundwater and require adherence to all applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Materials used in construction and maintenance of the project would be evaluated prior to use for their level of hazard. Manufacturer's directions and warnings would be followed during use. In addition, recommended, appropriate safety equipment would be used for each material.

Fueling and lubricating of construction equipment would occur within a designated and bermed location on the project construction site working segments. If a temporary fuel tank were used during construction, it would be stored within a bermed and sealed secondary containment structure. A Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) plan would be prepared and enforced to ensure that any spills are properly contained and disposed of.

Alternative A-1

Construction of Alternative A-1 would involve similar regulatory compliance requirements as discussed above for Alternative A.

b. Long Term

Alternative A

Long-term regulatory requirements for Alternative A would build upon construction-period regulated programs by appropriate federal, state, and local environmental and enforcement agencies. New project features would be integrated into pre-existing hazardous materials conditions and waste management programs associated with railroad operations.

Alternative A-1

Long-term regulatory compliance requirements for Alternative A-1 would be similar to those discussed above for Alternative A.

3-9.3 Potential Mitigation

3-9.3.1 Construction Period

a. Alternatives A and A-1

For either alternative, no mitigation measures would be required beyond regulatory requirements to reduce or avoid adverse and/or significant potential impacts related to public health and hazardous materials management during construction.

3-9.3.2 Long Term

a. Alternatives A and A-1

Since all specified regulatory requirements would be met, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would substantially increase the generation of uncontrolled hazardous materials. Routine maintenance of the proposed project would occasionally require the use of some hazardous chemicals or materials. Any such materials would be properly stored, handled, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and standards. Because the proposed project would not generate uncontrolled hazardous materials, and maintenance activities that would utilize hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations, no adverse (under NEPA)/significant (under CEQA) long-term impacts would occur.

3-9.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

3-9.4.1 Construction Period

a. Alternatives A and A-1

Incorporation of regulatory requirements would reduce the potential exposure of people to impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials to below the level of significance.

3-9.4.2 Long Term

a. Alternative A

The proposed project contains steps and measures to abate the site-specific hazards associated with hazardous materials/substances. Potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project would be expected to decrease as the harmful substances are removed from the vicinity and replaced with new infrastructure designed to capture and treat hazardous materials and by-products.

b. Alternative A-1

Similar beneficial effects of long-term hazardous materials management associated with Alternative A-1 are anticipated.

CHAPTER 12 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

12-1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains responses to the comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and Statement (DEIR/DEIS) during the Draft Environmental Document comment review period (September 3, 2004 through October 25, 2004).

Comment letters and forms were reviewed in order to respond to individual concerns. Tracking numbers were assigned to each response. A list of the commenters and their assigned tracking number can be found in Section 12-2. Those tracking numbers are shown in the margin of the scanned copy in Section 12-2.

12-2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

A total of 3 letters and 9 comments were received on the DEIR/DEIS. The 3 comment letters included submittals from 1 federal agency, 2 state agencies, 3 regional agencies, 3 county agencies, 1 city agency, 2 individuals, and 1 organization. A total of 7 verbal comments were received at the public hearing, 2 from individuals and 5 from 4 different business representatives.

The following is a list of commenters and the comment letter number that has been assigned. Public hearing commenters were also assigned numbers.

| Commenter | Assigned Comment Letter Number |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Los Angeles County Sheriff | 1 |
| RailPAC | 2 |
| Southern California Regional Rail Authority | 3 |
| South Coast Air Quality Management District | 4 |
| Joyce Dillard | 5 |
| United States Environmental Protection Agency | 6 |
| Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority | 7 |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation | 8 |
| California Governor's Office of Planning & Research, State Clearinghouse | 9 |
| State of California, Department of Transportation, Highway Patrol | 0 |
| County of Los Angeles Fire Department | 1 |
| Southern California Association of Governments | 2 |
| John Ulloth | 3 |

Comments and Responses

| Commenter | Assigned Public Hearing Comment |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dynamic Builders:Carol Lebowitz | PH-1 |
| Urgent Gear:Ram in Roofian | PH-2 |
| Dynamic Builders:Ken Jackson | PH-3 |
| Conoco Phillips:Dwight Hotchkiss | PH-4,PH-5 |
| Ken Ruben | PH-6 |
| James Clifton | PH-7 |

Comment Letter 1

Response to Letter 1

Comment 1-1

The request for information was conveyed to project engineers. E-mail communication was made with the Sheriff's Department to establish a time and date to review the area in question.

Comment 1-2

The proposed project would not result in an increase in elevation of tracks in the throat area of Union Station in the vicinity of the county jail.

From: Kameya, Mike R. (mailto:MKameya@lad.org)
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 10:12 AM
To: 'communications@throughtracks.org'
Subject: RE: LADS Concern

To whom it may concern:

I am forwarding the inquiry below to you for a response. Please insert your response via this email. Should you have any questions regarding this message, please contact me at the number listed below.

Thanks,

Mike Kameya

Facilities Planning Bureau

(626) 300-1013

-----Original Message-----
From: Christensen, Dennis D.
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 9:55 AM
To: Kameya, Mike R.
Subject: LADS Concern

Mike,

On Page 2-51 titled "LADS Throat Modifications" it states that modifications will be made to the throat area leading to LADS. This area is directly behind R07. Our potential concerns in IF Platforms 2 and 3 are raised and Leads 2 and 3 are also raised, what will be the height of the elevation throughout the throat.

Thanks,

Dennis D. Christensen, Sergeant

Custody Support Services

213-893-5097 (Office)

323-415-4444 (Direct Fax)

1-1

1-2

Comment Letter 2

5th October, 2005

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

District 7
 Division of Environmental Planning
 Ann Gary Iverson
 120 S. Spring Street
 MS 16A
 Los Angeles, CA 90012-3666

COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH 20022061071)

LOS ANGELES UNION STATION RUN THROUGH TRACKS PROJECT

To whom it may concern:

Dear Sir or Madam:

Our organization, Rail Passenger Association of California, ("RailPAC") has campaigned for the last 25 years for incremental improvements to rail passenger service, specifically along the San Diego – Los Angeles – San Luis Obispo line, now known as the Surfliner Corridor. Any improvement in the rail infrastructure on this route also benefits Metrolink trains and Amtrak long distance trains.

As the hub of this Southern California network, Los Angeles Union Station ("LAUS") is a critical component to the success of the system. Efficient station working, avoidance of conflicting movements, and sufficient capacity for growth are vital for a safe and punctual operation offering competitive transit times to potential riders. While high speeds gain more public attention, increasing the approach speed into the station, and cutting the corner from the south into the station, will have the same positive impact on journey times as many miles of 100mph running.

Our review of the draft EISE/BE finds nothing controversial, and this organization supports the document. Our only caveat is that we view the positive impacts to be understated. We firmly believe that reducing the station dwell time and overall running time of Surfliner trains should result in significant gains in ridership, attracting more passengers between Chatsworth and Anaheim for example. Furthermore, Metrolink will be able to offer more "cross-town" schedules. While important, we all know that LAUS is the final destination for a majority of L.A. basin commuters, and this project will enable train services between suburbs that should attract more people from their cars.

One item of news, which probably was announced after the draft, went to press, it appears that Amtrak is exiting the mail and express business so the relocation of that facility is a moot point.

In sum, we believe the draft EISE/BE has covered the issues well and RailPAC is pleased to lend its support to this process.

Signed:

Ric Silver, President
 Ross Jackson, Secretary
 Paul Dyson, Los Angeles Director.
 Rail Passenger Association of California
 10/07/05

2-1

2-2

2-3

Response to Letter 2

Comment 2-1

The benefits of proposed project to train operations are contained in Chapter 4 Section 4.1

Comment 2-2

Comment noted and support acknowledged.

Comment 2-3

According to Amtrak officials, the extent to which Amtrak may reduce express mail operations has not yet been determined. The proposed relocation of mail operations from Union Station to the vicinity of Washington Boulevard east of 4th Street remains part of the Run-Through Tracks project, as described in Chapter 2, Section 2-2.4(d).

Comment Letter 3

Response to Letter 3



San Gabriel and San Bernardino Regional Rail Authority

October 15, 2004

Gary Iverson
California Department of Transportation
District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
120 S. Spring Street, MS 16A
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606

RE: Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCORRA) Comments on the Los Angeles Union Station Run Through Tracks Project Draft EIR/EIS (SCH No. 2002061071)

Thank you for providing a full paper copy of this document to the SCORRA and for the opportunity to comment on this document. As background information, SCORRA is a five-county Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that operates the regional commuter rail system known as Metrolink on member agency-owned and on private freight railroad rights of way. Additionally, SCORRA provides a range of rail engineering, construction, operations and maintenance services to its five JPA member agencies. The JPA consists of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), San Bernardino Associated Governments (SABAG), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC).

SCORRA supports this project to construct run through tracks, which will increase the operating efficiency of Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS). The following are specific recommendations and requirements being conveyed by SCORRA after reviewing the DRE/EIS:

- 1. Since right of way into SCORRA member agency owned operating right of way will not be allowed without our agency's approval and because SCORRA will have to approve integration of the signal systems at each end of the run through tracks, SCORRA and MTA need to be listed as Responsible Agencies in the final EIR/EIS. 3-1
- 2. Page ES-5 - describes the project as connecting the south end of LAUS directly with the BNSF main line on the west side of the Los Angeles River. The main line on the west side of the river is actually owned by the MTA. Other parts of the document seem to refer to the same track as the SCORRA main line. Please consistently refer to the existing main line west of the river as the "SCORRA main line" since SCORRA provides rail engineering, construction, operations and maintenance services on this right of way. 3-2
- 3. Page ES-6 and page ES-9 - show two identical overall alignments for Alternatives A and 3-3

200 S. Flower Street 21st Floor Los Angeles CA 90017 Tel (213) 612-6200 Fax (213) 412-0425
www.metrolink.com

Comment 3-1

The jurisdiction of SCORRA as a responsible agency is acknowledged. The Executive Summary has been edited (new Section ES-5 and ES- 9) to include a discussion of responsible agencies.

Comment 3-2

The Final EIR/EIS has been edited to consistently refer to the main line on the west side of the Los Angeles River as the SCORRA Main Line."

Comment 3-3

The error in graphic content has been corrected in the Final EIR/EIS so that Figure ES-4 shows Alignment A, and Figure ES-5 shows Alignment A-1

Comment Letter 3

LAUS Run Through DGR-EIS Comments
October 15, 2008
Page 7

- A-1. Please identify which alternative is shown and provide the missing alignment. 3-3 cont'd
4. Page 1-7, paragraph 5. - identifies station improvements by SCORRA to allow train consist to be extended from three to four cars. This is incorrect, SCORRA is currently extending platforms to allow for eight-car trains. This is again misstated at the top of page 3-12.6. Instead, the new platforms 7 and 8 will need to allow for eight-car trains. 3-4
5. Page 1-19 - The second paragraph under Description, needs to be corrected to state that one stairwell and one elevator connect to the Gold Line Platforms 1; there are no ramps to Platform 1. The last sentence in the same paragraph needs to be changed to read, "none of the north ramps have been changed". 3-5
6. Page 2-54 - shows a plan view of the proposed new platforms, but should be corrected to specify the main ramp platform as 13' above the platforms, not 18". 3-6
7. Sheet 83 - This design represents a typical section 'A' where the 24-foot wide access road has to be separated by a bent, which supports the run through tracks above. Will this access road width meet fire code? 3-7
8. The document addresses SCORRA's needs for expanding service and for accommodating limitations at LAUS. It is critical that the construction is staged such that SCORRA will have the same track and platform capacity currently available. 3-8
9. The EIR/EIS should note the agreement between SCORRA and Amtrak that was executed 8/1/00, that states that maintenance of the run through tracks at LAUS will be shared between Amtrak and SCORRA based upon usage of the tracks. 3-9
10. The train control system for the run through tracks must be compatible with SCORRA's existing Centralized Traffic Control (CTC) system and with the existing track and signal circuits along the west bank. SCORRA main line and with the circuits in Union Station. The SCORRA signal system must be maintained in a fully functional state (except for the time required to "test over" the new track and signals) throughout the construction period for the new tracks. All work that affects the existing SCORRA signal systems must be performed by SCORRA's signal maintenance forces to assure integrity of the system under FRA regulations. 3-10
11. Any changes to the track configuration north of LAUS - the current route for south bound trains - should only add track capacity, not decrease capacity. 3-11
12. SCORRA looks forward to continuing to be a part of the project team. Our agency needs to continue to review and approve all preliminary and final designs that impact SCORRA operations, maintenance, right-of-way or stations. 3-12

Response to Letter 3

Comment 3-4

Pages 17 and 3-2.6 have been edited in the Final EIR/EIS to state the correct train lengths.

Comment 3-5

Page 10 has been edited in the Final EIR/EIS to make the submitted corrections.

Comment 3-6

Figure 2-3 has been edited to make the submitted correction.

Comment 3-7

The access road is considered to be in the existing service road category, and fire code requirements have already been considered in the design. The proposed bent in the middle of the roadway will not be a problem for fire trucks. During the next design phase the profile of the service road will be re-checked to ensure compliance with vertical clearance requirements.

Comment 3-8

There would be no loss of platform capacity during construction. The order of construction is meant to be conveyed by the sequence of bullets used to describe Alternative A in Chapter 2, Section 2-2.2.a. Operating

Response to Comment 3-8 continued:

capacity would be maintained during construction by the following steps: (1) elimination of the existing Mail Transfer Facility along the northeastern side of LAUS to accommodate new passenger platforms, Nos. 7 and 8(2) construction of new platforms (platform Nos. 7 and 8) and reintroduction of tracks (tracks 3, 4, 5 and 6) at the east end of the station. These new platforms would allow trains that now use platforms 2 and 3 to be shifted, and (3) elevation of existing platforms (platform Nos. 2 and 3) and the associated tracks (tracks 3, 4, 5 and 6).

Comment 3-9

Sections 2-2.2 and 2-2.3 have been edited to note that SCRRRA and Amtrak executed an agreement on September 1, 2000, that states that maintenance on the Run-Through Tracks would be shared between SCRRRA and Amtrak based upon usage of the tracks.

Comment 3-10

The signal system for the Run-Through Tracks would be compatible with SCRRRA's existing Central Traffic Control (CTC) system and existing signal circuits in LAUS and on the west bank SCRRRA main line. The functionality of SCRRRA's signal system would be maintained throughout the construction period. It is recognized that all work affecting the SCRRRA signal system would need to be performed by SCRRRA signal maintenance personnel.

Comment 3-11

Proposed changes to tracks in the throat area would increase train capacity and operating flexibility to/from the station. Please see Drawing 6n Volum e 2.

Comment 3-12

Comment noted.

Comment Letter 3

Response to Letter 3

LAURE Run Through DEIR/ES Comments
October 15, 2004
Page 3

13. In addition to the notification being given to Kelly Felty of SCRBA's Engineering Department, please send future public notices to the attention of David Solow at the address listed on this letterhead. 3-13

SCRBA appreciates the collaborative effort that has been present during the preliminary design and preparation of DEIR. Once again, thank you for allowing SCRBA's input on this DEIR/ES. If you have any questions regarding these comments please contact Deirdra Knox, Strategic Development Planner, at (212) 452-0159 or by e-mail at knex@scrba.com.

Sincerely,




David Solow
Chief Executive Officer

cc: David Valentinis, FRA
Warren Weber, Chairman
Patrick Merrill, Chairman
Angela Stern, Assistant
Patricia Chen, MTA
Susan Chapman, MTA
SCRBA Files

Mr. David Solow will receive future public notices of this project, as will Ms. Kelly Felty.

Comment Letter 4

Response to Letter 4



EA002 - OCTOBER 20, 2004

October 20, 2004

Mr. Gary Ivance
California Department of Transportation, District 7
120 Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)
for the Proposed Los Angeles Union Station Bus-Through Tracks Project - U.S.
Department of Transportation, District 7

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comments are meant as guidance for the Lead Agency and should be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.5, please provide the SCAQMD with written responses to all comments contained herein prior to the adoption of the Final Environmental Impact Report. The SCAQMD would be happy to work with the Lead Agency to address these issues and any other questions that may arise. Please contact Gordon Miles, Air Quality Specialist - CEQA Section, at (909) 396-3322, if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Susan Nakamura
Planning & Rules Manager
Planning, Rule Development & Area Services

Attachment

SN-004

LAK00000111
Control Number

Comment 4-1

The Final EIR/EIS includes responses to comments as well as a listing of mitigation measures that would be adopted to mitigate any air quality impacts found to be significant under CEQA. A copy of the Final EIR/EIS will be provided to the SCAQMD at least 0 days prior to certification of the EIR by the California Department of Transportation, as required by CEQA.

Comment 4-2

The following information about potential cancer risk that can be derived from data provided in the Draft EIR/EIS.

As described in the comment, upwards of 00 com muter train trips would result from the build alternatives by the year 2025 and these trains would be powered by diesel fuel. As can be seen in Table 3-2.8 Build vs. No Build Comparison, the amount of PM₁₀ emissions is expected to decrease by just under 00 pounds, primarily due to efficiencies over time in diesel locomotives to be acquired by SCRRA over the coming years that would reduce emissions. When compared to existing conditions (Table 3-2.7), the build alternatives would result in an even greater decrease in PM₁₀ emissions (approximately 300 pounds). Because there would be a net decrease in operational particulate matter with the build alternatives, cancer risk would also be expected to decrease.

Regarding exposure to diesel particulate matter during idling and the relationship to cancer risk:

- Locomotive stacks and temperature-induced buoyancy would tend to funnel the emissions upward and away from the passenger loading platforms.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Mr. Gary Inman -1- October 20, 2004 Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project - U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration/California Department of Transportation, District 7</p> | <p>4-2</p> <p>In the DEIR/EIS, 14 additional Amtrak passenger train trips are projected by 2010 plus trips from an additional 56 commuter trains are projected by 2010 along with another 31 commuter trains added between 2010 and 2025. It was also confirmed by telephone between CALTRANS District 7 and SCQMD staff that passenger and commuter locomotive trains would run on diesel fuel. Although operational emissions from the diesel passenger and commuter train emissions were estimated in the DEIR/EIS, the lead agency did not discuss or calculate potential cancer risk from the proposed project's increase in trips from diesel fueled trains.</p> <p>Since diesel particulates have been designated as a carcinogen by the California Air Resources Board and it appears that the proposed project will increase diesel particulate emissions at this site from train queuing and idling, it is recommended that cancer risks be calculated. The SCQMD has developed a methodology for estimating cancer risks from mobile sources in a document entitled Health Risk Assessment Guidelines for Airborne Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Emissions. This document can be downloaded from the AQMD's CERQA web page at the following URL: http://www.aqmd.gov/cerqa/healthbook/land_mstrkris1.doc.</p> |
| <p>4-3</p> <p>1) Change Railroad Operating Practices - Reducing idle time would definitely reduce diesel emissions. Locomotives that are not in use generally idle. Locomotive manufacturers indicate that engines could be shut-down and restarted when ambient temperatures are above 50 degrees Fahrenheit, which is nearly always the case in Southern California.</p> | <p>4-4</p> <p>2) Research and Development of New Engine Technologies - Modifying fuel injectors which include fuel injection processes, fuel spray pattern, injection rate and timing has been found to reduce emissions from locomotive diesel engines. Development of low NOx locomotive engines is based on the similar principle used in low NOx engines for the stationary power industry. Reduction of fuel injection can achieve significant NOx emissions reductions.</p> |

Response to Comment 4-2 continued:

- Potential passenger exposure to diesel particulate matter while waiting to board commuter trains would be on the order of several minutes, and even less when departing, which would be statistically inconsequential when compared to cancer risk methodologies based on continuous exposure for a period of 70 years.
- The alternative to potential exposure to diesel particulate matter while waiting to board a commuter train would be exposure to diesel particulate matter for longer durations while commuting on freeways, highways, and local roadways, as would be the case under the No-Project Alternative.

Comment 4-3

The proposed build alternatives shown in Table 3-2.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS result in a reduction of NO_x, SO₂, and PM₁₀ emission levels, with increases in CO and ROG levels that exceed the SCAQMD significance threshold. Since PM₁₀ emission levels would decrease, not increase as stated in the comment, there is no need to impose the cited mitigation measure for diesel particulate matter. It is important to note that one of the benefits of building the Run-Through Tracks

project would be to reduce the idling time of some locomotives that now must await an opportunity to enter or exit Union Station through the throat area at the north end of the station during peak travel periods.

Comment 4-4

See response to Comment 4B.

As stated in Chapter 3, Section 3-2.2.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the long-term analysis of operational air emissions impacts evaluates only the incremental difference in local South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) emissions from Metrolink trains, which compose the vast majority of trains that would operate over the proposed run-through tracks, together with any offsetting or incremental changes in motor vehicle traffic that would be necessary if the project were not implemented. The future emissions are based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) locomotive fleet-average emissions factors (USEPA 1997) projected for implementation of the more stringent locomotive emission standards under 40 CFR 2 and modified to reflect Tier III emission reductions for NO_x and PM₁₀ (USEPA 2003). The intent of the suggested mitigation measure has been incorporated into the analysis.

Comment Letter 4

Response to Letter 4

Comment 4-5

See response to Comment 44

Comment 4-6

Mitigation measures for the exceedances of NO_x and PM₁₀ CEQA thresholds during the construction period are identified in Chapter 3, Section 3-2.3.1a of the Draft EIR/EIS. Recommended measure number 1 corresponds to bullet 3 for NO_x. Recommended measures numbers 2 through 6 are included in the provisions for a Traffic Management Program (TMP), described in Section 3-2.5. Recommended measure number 8 corresponds to bullet 2 for NO_x. Recommended measures numbers 7 and 9 do not appear necessary in order to mitigate the level of impact. Recommended measures numbers 10 through 12 are standard construction practices included as contract requirements for Caltrans contracts and are also included in the mitigation bullets for particulate matter.

| | |
|--|------------|
| <p>Mr. Gary Swanson</p> <p>2</p> <p>October 20, 2004</p> <p><u>South Environmental Impact Report's environmental Impact Statement (SEIR/EIS) for the Proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project - U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, California Department of Transportation, District 7</u></p> <p>3) Research and Development of New Engine Technologies - Modifying fuel injectors which includes fuel injection pressure, fuel spray pattern, injection rate and timing has been found to reduce emissions from locomotive diesel engines. Development of low NO_x locomotive engines is based on the similar principle used in low NO_x engines for the stationary power industry. Refinement of fuel injection can achieve significant NO_x emission reductions.</p> <p>4) Research and Development of New Engine Technologies - Modifying fuel injectors which includes fuel injection pressure, fuel spray pattern, injection rate and timing has been found to reduce emissions from locomotive diesel engines. Development of low NO_x locomotive engines is based on the similar principle used in low NO_x engines for the stationary power industry. Refinement of fuel injection can achieve significant NO_x emission reductions.</p> | <p>4-5</p> |
| <p>3. Reduce construction air quality impacts from the proposed project except established daily significance thresholds for Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x) and PM₁₀ (relative dust). The SCAGQMD recommends the following mitigation measures to further reduce NO_x impacts from the project, if applicable and feasible:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Prohibit truck idling in excess of ten minutes. 2) Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference. 3) Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow. 4) Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hour to the extent practicable. 5) Remove construction trucks away from congested areas or sensitive receptor areas. 6) Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment into and off site. 7) Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel generators. 8) Give preference consideration to contractors who use clean fuel construction equipment equipped with field fuel treatment equipment that uses low sulfur diesel and is equipped with oxidation catalysts, particulate traps, or other needs technologies, etc. 9) Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a sustainability liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM₁₀ generation. 10) Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). 11) Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil is carried onto adjacent public paved roads (mechanical water sweepers with recaptured water). 12) Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit the construction site (covered mats or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each day). | <p>4-6</p> |

Comment Letter 4

Response to Letter 4

Mr. Gary Iversen -1- October 20, 2004

Final Environmental Impact Report/Developmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)
for the Proposed Low Avenue Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project - U.S.
Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration/Civilian
Department of Transportation, District 7.

4. In the Air Quality Technical Report in Appendix C on page 26, paragraph two makes reference to emission factors and assumptions detailed in "Appendix B." SCAQMD staff was unable to locate this reference in order to verify the emission factors and assumptions mentioned. The lead agency should clarify the location of this reference and ensure that the reference emission factors and assumptions are included in the Final EIR/EIS document. The SCAQMD could not otherwise verify the emission calculations listed in Table J-18.

4-7

Comment 4-7

The cited appendix has been added to Chapter 1 of the Final EIR/EIS. The SCAQMD is not responsible for the verification of calculations reported in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment Letter 5

-----Original Message-----
 From: Joyce Dillard [mailto:dillard@jovoyaboo.com]
 Sent: Monday, October 25, 2004 3:17 PM
 To: RunThrough Tracks
 Subject: Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project

- 5-1

The Central and Northeast areas of Los Angeles are expanding park land through bond propositions and measures. With this addition of capital, all mitigation measures need to include adverse effects on the children including their health. The Cornfield State Park is in the path of train traffic. A soccer field is planned in the vicinity of Soto Street and Mission Road.
- 5-2

The California Endowment is building a headquarters near Union Station. Their main funding goes for health leases.
- 5-3

Mitigation needs to occur with loss of any on-street parking. Because of the accelerated development in the city coupled with the relaxation of code requirements, Los Angeles is short of on-street parking. Affordable parking has not been addressed in the City. We must consider the pending development in the area.
- 5-4

The areas surrounding the Union Station are considered poverty areas qualifying for Federal Community Development Block Grants and other funding in Chinatown, Boyle Heights and Lincoln Heights.
- 5-5

Federal funding is being invested in Cherry Blossom Plaza in Chinatown. A development is under construction around Second and Alameda Streets. The William Reid Project, low-income housing, are in the near vicinity.
- 5-6

Railway travel is for distance travelers. The Metro lines have not met with the forecasted numbers of riders. Locals need their automobile transportation needs considered in any project in our area.
- 5-7

After speaking with Mel Flacilla from RCM Engineering Inc., the High-Speed Rail has no set design plans in mitigation here is for this Run-Through Tracks Project design only and not future needs of Union Station. The California High-Speed Train Program SER/EE mentions a dedicated (exclusive) track.
- 5-8

We understand that the HOLTZ project has the same concerns. Alternatives for these two projects need to be considered in the Environmental Impact Report of this project. Will Union Station and its Run-Through Tracks Project remain the same design for High-Speed Rail and METRAV?
- 5-9

Will the Water Quality remain the same? The City of Los Angeles has Bond Proposition C, Clean Water, Ocean Water, Beach, Bay Storm-water Cleanup Measure General Obligation Bonds on the ballot. The Los Angeles River is a target stream in the Proposition funds. Will this project involve more dollars than anticipated in the authoring of Proposition C?

Will Easeways need to be widened and is that considered in this SER?
 Joyce Dillard
 Los Angeles, CA

Do you TR00017
 Taboo! Mail Address AutoComplete - You stank. We ESHAB.
http://jovoyaboo.com/new_mail

Response to Letter 5

General Response

All known related projects in the area were listed in Appendix K, Related Projects of the Draft EIR/EIS. Chapter 3, Section 3-0 (Land Use), addressed potential impacts of land use changes in the area as well as impacts to redevelopment areas. Chapter 4 Other Impacts Considerations, addressed cumulative impacts.

Comment 5-1

The development of the Cornfield State Park project is listed in the Related Projects table in Appendix K. It is impacted away from the proposed project and will not be affected during the construction or operation phase. Any increase in train traffic that may pass near the new park would occur regardless of the proposed project. There are no project impacts from the Run-Through Tracks project to the new park, and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

The soccer field that is planned in the vicinity of Soto Street and Mission Road is across the Los Angeles River (a natural geographical boundary) and will not be affected by the proposed project.

Comment 5-2

The California Endowment project is listed in the Related Projects table in Appendix K, Related Projects. Although adjacent to the tracks leading into Union Station, it will not

Response to Comment 5-2 continued:

be affected during the construction or the operation phase.

Comment 5-3

As reported in the traffic impact analysis in Section, 3-2.4 Alternative A would not result in the loss of any on-street parking. Alternative A would result in the loss of three on-street parking spaces on Center Street due to the proposed location of Bent 7. The loss of three parking spaces, out of 8 in the area, would not be a significant impact under CEQA, and no mitigation is required. Pending development in the area was considered, as reported in Section 3-0.

Comment 5-4

The Chinatown Redevelopment plan was analyzed in Section 3-0. As shown in Table 3-0.1 the Run-Through Tracks project would have a neutral effect on the plan. No plans, policies, or goals are relevant to the proposed project.

Known projects in the Boyle Heights area are listed in Appendix K, and are generally located from 0.5 to 1 mile away from the project site. Please see our General Response above for more information. Projects in the Lincoln Heights area are not located within the study area and will not be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project. No comments were received from residents.

Comment 5-5

Cherry Blossom Plaza is within the Chinatown Redevelopment plan; see response to comment 5-4 above. The William Mead Homes development is adjacent to the tracks leading into

Union Station but will not be affected during the construction or operation phase. A public information meeting was held with the William Mead Homes Residents Association Committee on April 9 2003, and residents also received notices of subsequent meetings and of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment 5-6

As reported in Chapter 1 Section 2.1 LAUS serves an average revenue passenger trains each weekday, consisting of 26 SCRRRA intracity commuter trains (Metrolink), 25 Amtrak Pacific Surfliner service trains, and 8 Amtrak long-haul intercity trains. The number of trains using the station is forecast to grow from 10 today to 223 by 2000 and 270 by 2025. The need for freeway and street improvements in the area is under consideration by the California Department of Transportation (i.e., widening of U.S. 101) and the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) (e.g., widening Center Street and Alameda Street).

Comment 5-7

Plans for the Run-Through Tracks project considered the long-term plans for potential high-speed rail and Maglev services at Union Station, based on the available information on these two projects (see Chapter 2, Sections 2-3.5 and 2-3.6). The Run-Through Tracks project does not conflict with these projects and does not preclude their future implementation, nor does this project's purpose and need necessarily facilitate any future high speed rail or Maglev services at Union Station.

Comment 5-8

Please see Chapter 3-§Hydrology and Water Quality, for a full discussion of impacts to water quality. The Run-Through Tracts project would have only minor water quality impacts. (Only during construction? Perhaps add references to measures included in ED to address water quality concerns). The proposed project will be compliant with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as Amended by the Clean Water Act of 1977 (33 USC 1251 et seq.), the Clean Water Act, the Porter-Cologne Act, NPDES permits and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. All of these acts, permits and plans have standard protocols (BMPs) for maintaining clean water.

Additionally, Proposition 13 funds pertain to water quality projects and not to transportation project and thus cannot be

utilized for the construction and operation of the proposed project.

Comment 5-9

The proposed project will not cause any need for freeway widening. The widening of the 01 freeway is a planned project of the California Department of Transportation and was considered in the design and environmental analysis of the Run-Through Tracts project. Please see Chapter 2, Section 2-3.2.1 for a description of the 01 freeway widening project.

Comment Letter 6

07-08-0004 09:54:17 PROTOCOL:ENVIS DT ENU PLAN 21:30:7632 10/25/04 808 18:17 FAX 415 947 3582 U.S. EPA



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
 75 Haytheburg Street
 San Francisco, CA 94105-3801

October 25, 2004

David Valentin
 Federal Railroad Administration
 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW, MS 20
 Washington, D.C. 20590

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project, Los Angeles County, CA (CEQA# 046434)

Dear Mr. Valentin:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project in Los Angeles County, California. Our review is pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Our detailed comments on the Draft EIS are enclosed.

The proposed project would extend two of the existing tracks southward from Union Station and provide a connection into the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway mainline on the west side of the Los Angeles River. EPA is supportive of that project, specifically in its potential to reduce motor vehicle emissions by facilitating more efficient commuter train operation at Union Station.

Based on EPA's review of the potential effects of proposed actions and the adequacy of the information in the Draft EIS, we have rated the document IC-2 (Environmental Concerns - Insufficient Information). Our concerns are based on air quality and aquatic resources. Specifically, EPA's review identified a need to clarify (1) the general and/or transportation consistency determinations, (2) assumptions behind the criteria air pollutant data, (3) mitigation proposed to mitigate impacts to air quality, and (4) status of Los Angeles River restoration projects in relation to the proposed project. The enclosure further describes the concerns that EPA identified. A "Summary of Finding Deficiencies" for further details on EPA's rating system is also provided.

- 6-1
- 6-2
- 6-3
- 6-4

Printed on Recycled Paper

Response to Letter 6

Comment 6-1

Conformity applies to the proposed project because funding for the project could include Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds and because it is included in an element of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The proposed project is also considered to demonstrate conformity because it is included in the RTP, and the commuter trains accommodated by the proposed project form the underlying basis for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Comment 6-2

Regarding the assumptions for the criteria pollutant data, a copy of Appendix B has been included in chapter 2 of Final EIR/EIS, and contains the detailed assumptions that were used in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment 6-3

Response to the issue of air quality mitigation is addressed in Responses 6 and 6 below and in chapter 3-2, Air Quality.

Comment 6-4


Response to the issue of Los Angeles River restoration is addressed in Response 6 below.

Comment Letter 6

Response to Letter 6

Comment 6-5

Two copies of the Final EIR/EIS will be sent to the USEPA address at mail code CMD-2.



Comment Letter 6

Response to Letter 6

Comment 6-6

Since the South Coast Air Basin was not designated for non-attainment of PM_{2.5} at the time the environmental document was prepared, no analysis of this pollutant was prepared for the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment 6-7

The proposed project is designed to serve only the anticipated commuter needs of Union Station. Freight trains do not enter into Los Angeles Union Station. The Run-Through Tracks will not serve freight trains and will not facilitate an increase in freight traffic. Accordingly, no air quality analyses related to freight trains were conducted for the RTP or the Draft EIR/EIS.

Regarding the conformity question, please see the response to 6labove. Regarding the project's ability to demonstrate conformity with the General Conformity requirements should no FHWA or FTA funding be available, the proposed project is not considered regionally significant from an air quality perspective, as demonstrated by comparing the Build to the No-Build criteria pollutant emissions. As a consequence, a conformity determination is not required under General Conformity.

Comment 6-8

The conformity determination did not assume an increase

Comment Letter 6

| Comment ID | Comment Text | Response Text |
|------------|--------------|---------------|
| 6-6 | 6-6 | 6-6 |
| 6-7 | 6-7 | 6-7 |
| 6-8 | 6-8 | 6-8 |
| 6-9 | 6-9 | 6-9 |
| 6-10 | 6-10 | 6-10 |

Comment Letter 6

Response to Letter 6


in freight traffic since the proposed project would not serve freight trains. It would serve only passenger trains (Amtrak and Metrolink).

Comment 6-9

Please see response 6A above.

Comment 6-10

Data to support the contention that CO hot spots would not be likely to occur is provided in the traffic impact analysis reported in Chapter 3, Section 3-5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Table 3-5 indicates that the project would not result in changes to the forecast traffic in 2000 for the U.S. 01m main line Level of Service (LOS), compared to current LOS (see Table 3-3). By 2025 the forecasted LOS for the U.S. 01m main line would degrade from LOS C for the PM period, northbound direction, and for the AM period, southbound direction, to LOS D. This level of degradation would not be sufficient to create CO hotspots since even at LOS D the volume-to-capacity ratio of the freeway segment is less than 1.0. A V/C ratio of less than 1.0 would not generate extensive idling, one of the conditions that typically accompany a CO hotspot. Potential LOS changes were assessed for nine street intersections in the vicinity of the proposed project. As shown in Table 3-3 there would be no change in LOS at these intersections in 2000 or 2025 thus, there would be no creation of CO hotspots attributable to the project.



Comment Letter 6

021-08-0004 01-04A FIDP-CAL-101940 DT 04U PLUH 23-09170702 10/18/2015
 14/VEE/TA MW 11:47 FAX 415 847 2144 T.A.BEA (OR)

Recommendation:

The Final EIS should provide a quantitative analysis, if feasible, to support the conclusion that no CO hotspots will occur as a result of this project. If no data is available to support the conclusion, then that should be identified.

Impact Analysis Assumptions

The project will result in exceedances of the operation and construction thresholds established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District for CO and reactive organic gases (ROG), as identified in Section 3-2.3.2. The Draft EIS also states that criteria pollutant generation under the Build Alternative would be less than with the No-Build Alternative. Assumptions factored into the No-Build estimates values presented include the additional motor vehicle emissions that would be expected if no additional Metrolink service was provided. The additional emissions would result from an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from the equivalent of 238 passengers for 33 trains. EPA recognizes that this project provides a transit option and an opportunity to minimize impacts resulting from increasing VMT; however, the Draft EIS should discuss what the increase in criteria pollutants would be if the actual train ridership does not equal the estimates provided.

Recommendation:

Clarify the assumptions regarding the determination of the number of estimated single-passenger vehicle, carpool, and bus users who will switch modes of travel to the proposed increase in Metrolink trains, thereby reducing VMT in the region. The Final EIS should analyze and disclose the estimated impacts to air quality in the region should VMT not be reduced by the estimated 238 passengers for each of 33 trains.

Mitigation Measure

The Draft EIS states that mitigation measures are only required under the California Environmental Quality Act. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), "all relevant, reasonable mitigation measures that could improve the project are to be identified. Mitigation measures must be considered even for impacts that by themselves would not be considered significant. Once the proposal itself is considered as a whole to have significant effects...mitigation measures must be developed where it is feasible to do so" (see Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 1961, "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations"). CEQ also issued guidance on integrating pollution prevention measures in NEPA documents and NEPA documents (1993 Memorandum on Pollution Prevention and NEPA).

Section 3-2.3.2 of the Draft EIS states that because criteria pollutant generation under the Build Alternative would be less than with the No-Build Alternative, the Build Alternative can be considered as mitigation measures for future conditions. Regardless of what conditions are projected in design year 2025 without the build project, there is a need to identify all reasonable

Response to Letter 6

Comment 6-11

See response 6D.

Comment 6-12

Chapter 3, Section 3-2, Table 3-2.6 provides information on air quality emissions should growth not reach the forecast number for 200 of daily trains and 235 daily trains for 2025. Line of the table shows the air quality where growth does not go beyond the existing 26 trains. Line 4 of the table reports the air quality if train growth were capped in 200 at 3 daily trains (which represents the probable station capacity without the proposed project) and the impacts of traffic equivalent to the 3 trains that would not be able to use the station without the project. Table 3-2 shows the emissions in 2025 for 235 trains, which can be reached only with construction of the proposed project.

Comment 6-13

The modal split used in calculations is shown in Air Quality Appendix B, in chapter of the Final EIR/EIS. The figure of 28 passengers per train was based upon actual boarding data provided by SCRRA. The impacts to regional air quality for 3 trains with 28 passengers per train are reported in Line 3 of Table 3-2.6

Comment Letter 6

DEC-05-0004 601-564 FPOH/DL/TH945 DT EMO PLUM (213007970)
 10/23/04 MON 10:48 FAX 415 847 3882 U.S. EPA (CRS)

10/26/2005 10:17:19
 Q 001

mitigation measures to reduce emissions of criteria air pollutants. In addition, this approach appears to be based on an assumed level of VMT being removed from roadways and reallocated to commuter rail utilization. The Draft EIS should clarify Section 3-2.3, Potential Mitigation, to reflect all appropriate mitigation measures. In some sections of the Draft EIS, specific mitigation measures are listed and identified as specific commitments and are introduced in the following format: "The following mitigation measures will be implemented to mitigate potential impacts" (Public Protection, Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources). Mitigation measures are not presented in this format in the Air Quality section, resulting in the impression that no mitigation measures will be implemented.

Recommendations:

Consistent with CEQ's guidance, present all reasonable mitigation and pollution prevention features in the Final EIS. Evaluate the feasibility of mitigation to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse environmental impacts from construction and operations. Consult to specific measures to minimize impacts to air quality from the construction and operation of the facility. EPA recommends that specific mitigation measures for air quality impacts be listed in the same format applied to other resources.

EPA recommends including a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan for fugitive dust and diesel particulate matter (DPM) in the Draft EIS. EPA does not agree with the conclusion that use of alternative-fueled or new equipment is not an effective mitigation measure because this would only shift nitrogen oxides emissions from one location in the SCAB to another. Use of newer technologies would reduce diesel particulate matter in the project area. In addition, the Draft EIS states that it is not feasible to require contractors to use current construction equipment because there will be several different subcontractors utilized at the same time. Any use of newer equipment will reduce emissions and we encourage the Federal Railroad Administration to adopt such measures. EPA recommends the following mitigation measures be evaluated for feasibility and included in the Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in order to reduce impacts associated with emissions of PM10 and other toxics from construction-related activities:

- * Establish an activity schedule designed to minimize traffic congestion around the construction site.
- * Utilize EPA-regulated particulate traps and other appropriate controls to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.
- * Locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors such as children and the elderly as well as away from fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.
- * Use low sulfur fuel (diesel with 15 parts per million or less).
- * Reduce use, trips, and unnecessary idling from heavy equipment.
- * Lease newer and cleaner equipment (1996 or newer), and
- * Periodically inspect construction sites to ensure construction equipment is properly maintained at all times.

Response to Letter 6

Comment 6-14

The SCAQMD has provided additional construction and operational mitigation measures, which will be considered and their feasibility assessed. Chapter 3, Section 3-2.3, of the Final EIR/EIS has been edited to clarify mitigation measures.

Comment 6-15

Chapter 3, Section 3-2.3, of the Final EIR/EIS has been edited to clarify mitigation measures.

Comment 6-16

See response 6

Comment 6-17

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be prepared to track implementation of mitigation measures included in the Final EIR/EIS. The program would identify who will be responsible for implementing the measures as well as the appropriate project phase or phases for implementation. Fugitive dust mitigation and applicable diesel particulate matter mitigation will be included in the MMRP. The California Department of Transportation will adopt the MMRP as part of its approval of the project, as required by CEQA.

Comment 6-18

The recommended mitigation measures will be considered for implementation and identified in the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment Letter 6

Response to Letter 6

Comment 6-19

There is no discussion of regional efforts to restore the Los Angeles River because the proposed project has no relationship to those efforts. The project lies outside the boundaries of the river embankment. For the project to be included in the river plan in any meaningful way would require the relocation of the entire railroad corridor of BNSF and SCRRA Mainline tracks that runs parallel to the west bank of the river. Inasmuch as this corridor is part of the regional and national rail network, such relocation is highly unlikely.

Comment 6-20


See response ¶¶

Comment 6-21

Design of drainage facilities would be in accordance with California Department of Transportation, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, and SCRRA design standards. Although these standards do not specifically address the potential for harboring mosquitoes and other vector species, they are intended to foster the proper drainage of water and generally preclude creating standing water locations.

Comment 6-22

See response ¶21



Comment Letter 7

Response to Letter 7

Comment 7-1



October 25, 2004

Gary Iverson
 California Department of Transportation
 District 7, Division of Environmental Planning
 120 S. Spring Street MS 16A
 Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606

RE: Draft EIR for the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project
 Dear Mr. Iverson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR for the Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) Run-Through Tracks Project. This letter conveys the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (MTA) comments concerning issues that are germane to our agency's statutory responsibilities.

1. The potential impact to both Metro Gold and Red Line passengers by the construction of this project needs to be further analyzed and addressed in the Final EIR. Two of the close proximity of the western half of the proposed project (Platform 2, Tracks 3 and 4) to the Metro Gold Line, there will be some coordination required during various phases of the project. As the non-operational window is less than two hours nightly, it would be appropriate for the discussion to discuss construction and coordination strategies to be used to ensure continuity of Metro Gold Line services during the construction. The following operational issues at LAUS may help define the strategies:

- Metro Gold Line operates from 3:56am to 2:07am, leaving only 1-43 with no train activity.
- Currently there are approximately 100 trains servicing Union Station on weekdays, 90 on weekend days (normal operations).
- With the opening of the Eastside Extension, train traffic will effectively double on the Metro Gold Line (through train operations).
- Capacity reduction/re-balancing from Platform 2 may require the Metro Gold Line overhead catenary system (OCS) to be de-energized, due to the close proximity.

2. Please note that the Eastside Light Rail project will not include trackage from Alameda and Ducommun Streets to the Red Line yard. Please also note that the Metro Gold Line began revenue operations in July 2003.

3. At the October 13, 2004 Open House and Public Comments, project engineers stated that the aerial structure support columns will be positioned in such a manner as to not interfere with the Metro Red Line portal or tunnel structure in any way. The Final EIR should clearly show the design of the Run-Through Tracks

Operation of the Gold Line service from Platform would not be compromised by construction of the Run-Through Tracks Project. The operating capacity of Union Station, and thus the number of commuter trains utilizing the station and potentially interfacing with Gold Line service, would be maintained during construction by the following steps: (1) Elimination of the existing Mail Transfer Facility along the northeastern side of the LAUS to accommodate new passenger platforms Nos. 7 and 8 (2) Construction of new platforms (Platform Nos. 7 and 8) and reintroduction of tracks (Tracks 3, 4, 5 and 6) at the east end of the station. These new platforms would allow trains that now use Platform 2 and 3 to be shifted. (3) Elevation of existing platforms (Platform Nos. 2 and 3) and the associated tracks (Tracks 3, 4, 5 and 6) in coordination with MTA and SCRRRA during the construction phase would be provided so that any construction related to the Run-Through Tracks Project elements would occur during non-operational hours of the light rail and commuter rail services. The potential need to temporarily remove power from the light rail catenary at Platform is noted for the record.

Comment 7-2

The change in previously planned LRT service tracks on Ducommun Street, between Alameda and the Red Line service yard is noted. The design of either Alternative A

Comment Letter 7

001-45-0004 03-18-09 FROM: COL 38465 OF: BAO PLUM 21.30917672 TO: 10176270483
 MTR BUS SYS PLANNING FAX: 213-752-7460

7-3
 cont'd

7-4

Project will avoid impacts to the Metro Red Line portal. The proposed aerial railroad right-of-way will cross over the Metro Red Line at Commercial Street and Center Street, where MTA operates a tunnel.

7-5

4. We understand that as part of the proposed construction plans, Platforms 7 and 8 (Tracks 11-16) will be rebuilt and used for SCRRA and Amtrak service while Platforms 2 and 3 are out of service. Since passenger demand on the Transit Plaza/Metro Headquarters entrance to the Metro Red Line will be significantly greater on a temporary basis, the EIR should discuss impacts to pedestrian travel patterns and any necessary mitigations. Please consider that current passenger flow from Platforms 2 and 3 (as well as the Metro Gold Line) is generally to the Metro Red Line via the Alameda/Union Station entrance (west). Currently, 33% of passengers entering the Metro Red Line Station are from the Alameda/Union Station side and 67% from the Transit Plaza/Metro Headquarters side. The passenger flow is at a maximum level for short periods of time during the peak hours and tapers off at about 120 persons per minute.

7-6

5. Since the proposed project also impacts property owned by MTA, any changes in design of the street realignment need to be identified and analyzed. For example, on Sheet 23 of the proposed track plans, the proposed aerial structure is shown to cross the MTA property at 815 Commercial Street (Rancho Fresh Market). The track plans on this page also indicate a realignment of Commercial Street which creates right up to a center of the property line of MTA's 815 Commercial Street property, but does not actually take any of the MTA property. Please clarify whether this will impact MTA's property at this location.

7-7

6. Similarly, Sheet 23 of the track plans indicates the proposed railroad alignment crossing over the middle of MTA property on the south side of Commercial Street (across from 815 Commercial Street). Sheet 23 indicates various property ownership, but does not indicate the MTA property ownership at this crossing. This crossing is an aerial structure that divides the MTA property in half and will impact future use and development of this property. MTA may have to seek compensation for this impact.

7. Any changes affecting MTA property along the railroad alignment must be coordinated with Metro Rail Operations. For example, Sheet 24 of the proposed track plans shows the MTA Metro Red Line yard and the proposed new railroad alignment to the east of the Metro Red Line Yard site that will run westerly adjacent to the LA River. The study plan drawings indicate the relocation of a MTA signal house, realignment of the MTA maintenance road and realignments of the MTA fencing separating its property from the adjacent property to the east.

MTA looks forward to reviewing the Final EIR, and participating with the design of this project. If you have any questions regarding this response, please call Susan Chapman, Transportation Planning Manager, at (213) 712-6908 or contact her via e-mail at schapman@metro.net.

Sincerely,

Margaret Finn

Douglas Elm, ASCE
 Director, Long Range Planning

cc: Dreda Knox, SCRRA

Response to Letter 7

or A-1 would be modified during the next phase of design to reflect this change, but does not change the overall environmental impacts presented in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment 7-3

Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS provided plan and profile drawings for the proposed alignments of Alternative A and A-1. Drawing sheet 3 illustrates the structural plan for avoiding (spanning) the Red Line Tunnel for Alternative A. Alternative A-1 would avoid (span) the Red Line Tunnel in a similar manner.

Comment 7-4

The overall amount of pedestrian traffic to and from SCRRA trains, with regard to it being from the west (Union Station) or from the east (Transit Plaza), would not change as a result of platform changes associated with the Run-Through Tracks Project. All commuter rail platforms affected are bracketed within the same boundaries, so there would be no change in the volume of passengers. There would be a shift in the destinations of some patrons.

Response to Comment 7-4 continued:

Due to the high number of pedestrians accessing the project site an evaluation of pedestrian Level-of-Service (LOS) was conducted. This analysis is based upon the methodology as detailed in the Transportation Research Board National Research Council Highway Capacity Manual 2000. The qualitative measures of pedestrian flow are similar to those used for vehicular flow. These elements include speed and maneuverability. This would include those walking with the main pedestrian flows and those walking in the reverse direction. As with the vehicular flow, pedestrian flow is measured in terms of LOS. The following table details pedestrian walkway LOS as described in the Highway Capacity Manual 2000.

| Pedestrian Walkway LOS | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| LOS | Description of Operating Characteristics | Pedestrian Space and Flow Rate |
| A | Movement in desirable paths without alteration in response to others. Speeds freely selected and conflicts unlikely. | Space > 60 ft ² /p Flow rate ≤ 5p/min/ft |
| B | Same as above. At this level, pedestrians begin to be aware of others and respond to their presence when selecting a pace | Space >40-60 ft ² /p Flow rate ≤ 5-7p/min/ft |

| Pedestrian Walkway LOS | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| LOS | Description of Operating Characteristics | Pedestrian Space and Flow Rate |
| C | Enough space for normal walking speeds and bypassing others. Reverse direction or crossing movements can cause minor conflicts | Space >24-40 ft ² /p Flow rate ≤ 7-10p/min/ft |
| D | Individual walking speed and ability to pass others restricted. High probability of conflict when crossing or traveling in reverse flow. Provides reasonably fluid flow, but friction and interaction likely. | Space > 15-24 ft ² /p Flow rate ≤ 10-15p/min/ft |
| E | Walking speed restricted. Space is not sufficient for passing slower pedestrians. Cross or reverse flow movements difficult. Volumes approach the limit of the walkway capacity with stoppages and interruptions to flow. | Space > 8-15 ft ² /p Flow rate ≤ 15-23 p/min/ft |

| Pedestrian Walkway LOS | |
|------------------------|---|
| LOS | Description of Operating Characteristics |
| F | <p>Walking speed severely restricted. Frequent unavoidable contacts with other pedestrians. Cross or reverse flow movements virtually impossible. Flow is sporadic and unstable. Space characteristic of queued pedestrians rather than moving streams.</p> |
| | <p>Pedestrian Space and Flow Rate</p> <p>Space $\leq 8 \text{ ft}^2/\text{p}$</p> <p>Flow rate varies</p> |

Comment 7-5

As stated in Chapter 2, Project Description, the proposed project accommodates the widening of Commercial Street, which is proposed by LADOT. The design shows on Sheet 23 reflects an accommodation of this proposed realignment. No impacts, to the MTA property are anticipated.

Comment 7-6

Chapter 3-J Acquisitions and Displacements, discloses all known potential impacts to affected properties in the path of the alignment. MTA property ownership is disclosed within this chapter. The chapter also describes the acquisition process, which includes entitlement of the fair market value of affected parcels.

Comment 7-7

Pedestrian flows in the tunnel was analyzed using the above criteria and found that the tunnel would operate at LOS D or better.

MTA involvement in periodic review of run-through track planning was initiated during the Alternatives Analysis phase; continued during the Conceptual Engineering phase, which was contemporaneous with preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS; and will continue during Preliminary Engineering and Final Design phases.

Comment Letter 8

Response to Letter 8

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
1155 LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 1000
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PH: 213 333 1311
FAX: 213 333 1348

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



JAMIE S. HEINON
MAYOR

October 20, 2004

Mr. David Valentine
Federal Railroad Administration
1120 Vermont St, NW, MS-30
Washington, D.C. 20590

Mr. Gary Iverson
Caltrans, District 7
1220 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT / DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION FOR THE LOS ANGELES UNION STATION RUN-THROUGH TRACKS PROJECT

The Los Angeles City Department of Transportation (LADOT) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) / Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Section 4(f) Evaluation for the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. LADOT supports this regionally significant project. LADOT prefers Alternative A-1, which runs along the north side of Commercial Street, since we are planning to develop a bus maintenance facility on the south side of this street.

The following items need to be addressed in the EIR/EIS:

- 1. The Run-through Tracks Project should anticipate and plan for the probable future deployment of the High Speed Train project, as proposed by the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), and/or the Maglev project, as proposed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Such planning should take into account issues including, but not limited to, preferred track configuration and location, and necessary track capacity. Accordingly, agencies sponsoring the Run-through Tracks Project should coordinate planning with the CHSRA and SCAG, as appropriate.
- 2. Appendix B drawings show realignment of Commercial Street east of Center Street. This realignment needs to be discussed and its impacts on access and circulation

8-1

8-2

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

Comment 8-1

Plans for the Run-Through Tracks project considered the long-term plans for potential high-speed rail and Maglev services at Union Station, based on the available information on these two projects (see Chapter 2, Sections 2-3.5an 2-3.5b). The Run-Through Tracks project does not preclude their future implementation.

Comment 8-2

The proposed realignment of Commercial Street east of Center Street was already included in the assessment of impacts on access and circulation reported in the Final EIR/EIS. That assessment indicated no change in LOS for the street intersections in the study area as of the proposed project. The realigned street was illustrated in Appendix B at current standards. Consideration of alternate designs to avoid this realignment will be made in the next phase of the design and in consultation with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering.

Comment Letter 8

10176276653 P1373

Messrs. David Valentin & Gary Iverson 2 October 20, 2004

8-2
cont'd

need to be addressed in the EIREIS. The Bureau of Engineering must be consulted on up-grading the realigned street to current standards. In addition, consideration should be given to alternate designs to avoid this realignment, if possible.

8-3

3. Appendix B drawings show support columns in the middle of the alley east of Center Street just north of Commercial Street. If an alternate design is not feasible, the access and circulation impacts of the closure of this alley need to be addressed in the EIREIS.

8-4

4. Consideration should be given to signalizing the intersection of Center Street and Commercial Street due to restricted visibility.

If you have any questions, please call me at (213) 590-1187 or Vahsan Puzeshkian at (213) 590-0940.

Sincerely,

James M. Chazaki
Assistant General Manager
LAADOT

Councilmember Jan Perry, Council District 9
Councilmember Antonio Villaraigosa, Council District 14

C:\p\jerry\perry\letter\letter08102004

Response to Letter 8

Comment 8-3

The referenced alley east of Center Street is actually the old alignment of the street, before it was realigned to pass under U.S. 01 and is offered only for Alternative A-1 That alternative includes the acquisition of the parcel occupied by 01 Commercial Street, which abuts the alley to the east. As reported in chapter 3, Section 3-1 it is assumed that under Alternative A-1 that the entire parcel (3-09006) would be acquired and the building demolished. If the column shown in old Center Street cannot be shifted, replacement access to the unnamed roadway adjacent to U.S. 01 on the north side of parcel 3-09006 can be provided once the building is demolished.

Comment 8-4

The potential signalization of the intersection of Center Street and Commercial Street due to restricted visibility will be evaluated in the final design phase of the project.

Comment Letter 9

Response to Letter 9
Comment 9-1

The close of the comment period on October 25 2004 has been noted as well as the forwarding of comments from the California Highway Patrol.



9-1

Comment Letter 9

Response to Letter 9

NOU-1-0004 00183P FROM:CALTRANS DT EAU PLUM 2130776732 TO:R6270053 P13-4
 Document Details Report
 State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCM# 366284271
 Project Title Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project
 Lead Agency Caltrans #7

Type EIR Draft EIR

Description The proposed improvements to Union Station would extend two of the existing tracks southward from Union Station and provide a new connection into the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway station on the west side of the Los Angeles River; this would allow some trains that use the station to avoid the rail hump and sidings that incurs delays either at the station platforms or on the connecting tracks while waiting for a slot at the platforms. The proposed structure would form an S-curve, connecting all its southeast end to track platforms at Union Station and its southwest end to a point along the BNSF tracks in the vicinity of the First Street Bridge. A range of potential alignment alternatives to increase accessibility to platforms are also proposed.

Lead Agency Contact
 Name Gary Iversen
 Agency Department of Transportation, District 7
 Phone (714) 591-2818 Fax
 Address 130 S. Spring Street, MS 15A
 City Los Angeles State CA Zip 90012-3008

Project Location
 County Los Angeles
 City Los Angeles, City of
 Region Alameda Street at First Street
 Cross Street Alameda Street at First Street
 Parcel No. Range 130N Section Base
 Township 1S

Priority to:
 Highways U.S. 101
 Airports LA International 16.6km away
 Railroads BNSF and UPRR
 Waterways Los Angeles River
 Schools Granada High
 Land Use Urban

Project Risks
 Aesthetic/Visual: Air Quality, Archaeology/Historic, Cumulative Effects, Drainage/Moisture/Infiltration, Economic/Job, Final Project, Flood Peak/Flooding, Geologic/Seismic, Growth Inducing, Land Use, Materials, Noise, Population/Housing, Recreation, Public Services, Recreation/Parks, School/University, Sewer Capacity, Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading, Solid Waste, Traffic/Accidents, Traffic/Congestion, Vegetation, Water Quality, Water Supply, Wetland/Paratran, Wildlife

Reviewing Agencies
 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Department of Parks and Recreation; Native American Heritage Commission; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Department of Motor Resources; California Highway Patrol; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Air Resources Board; Transportation Projects; Public Utilities Commission

Date Received 04/05/2004 Start of Review 05/05/2004 End of Review 10/25/2004

Note: Blank or data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

Comment Letter 10


Response to Letter 10

Comment 10-1

The traffic impact analysis in Chapter 3, Section 3-5 considered potential impacts to U.S. 01 during the construction period as follows: Run-Through construction activities would involve primarily the shoulders and median of U.S. 01. Construction of the supports would not require closure of freeway lanes as part of the project. The support in the middle of the freeway will occur on part of the widening realignment of the U.S. 01 project. Some short-term lane closures may be required to move equipment in and out of the median and install the bridge spans across the freeway. These closures would occur during off-peak hours. Therefore, potential impacts associated with construction over U.S. 01 are expected to be minimal.

As with all construction projects involving freeways, the department would include development of a TMP. As stated in Chapter 3, Section 3-5, the TMP would be created in consultation with the department and LADOT and would prescribe how any lane closures, detours, sidewalk closures, and property access changes would be handled. The TMP would also include requirements for advance public notification of traffic changes and a means of contact for problems or questions.

Section 3-5 has been edited to add the California Highway Patrol Central Los Angeles Area Office to those to be consulted in the development of the TMP.



Comment Letter 11


Response to Letter 11

Comment 11-1

It has been noted that the project is not in the emergency response area of the Los Angeles County Fire Department's Consolidated Fire Protection Division.

Comment 11-2

It has been noted that the project is near the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles County Fire Department, but it would not require comments from the department's Land Development Unit. It is also noted that the Los Angeles County Fire Department will be a consulting party when the TMP for this project is being developed to ensure emergency response pathways are maintained.




Comment Letter 11

Response to Letter 11

Comment 11-3

It is noted that the areas of responsibility of the department's Forestry Division were addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS.



Comment Letter 12

Response to Letter 12

Comment 12-1

The consistency of the proposed project with SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, and Regional Transportation Plan are noted.

Comment 12-2

Publication in the September \$ 2004 Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse report is noted.



Comment Letter 13

11/02/2014 15:18 FAX

#1310115

John Ullrich
13009 Columbus Avenue
Mission Hills, California 91345

David Weinstein
F.R.A. Environmental Program Manager
400 7th Street, SouthWest, Malibu 20
Washington, District of Columbia 20090
(202) 493-0365

Gary Iverson
California District 7
120 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 897-0665

RE: Change of Scope/Unstudied Historic Alternative needed immediately on Los Angeles Union Station Run-through Tracks Project
(Note: for brevity, please focus on subjects emphasized in bold type for convenience)

Dear Messrs. Weinstein for F.R.A., & Iverson for CalTrans,

A mistake is being made regarding the draft EIR/EIS' alignment of the Run-Through Tracks Project at Los Angeles Union Station (L.A.U.S.). Correcting the mistake now will reduce millions in long-term costs and keep the best options open for expansion of commuter & Amtrak operations and new platforms of California High Speed Rail at L.A.U.S.:

Run-through tracks should have been built before "day-1" when Union Station opened, thank you for addressing this problem! Thanks to the beginning of Metrolink and the transformation of Amtrak's San Diego into the Sunliner, the number of main line trains at L.A.U.S. has again exceeded their number when L.A.U.S. was at its peak, making run-through tracks a pressing need again. Come right, your project will 1) improve passenger operations by shortening passenger train running times, 2) begin to relieve L.A.U.S.'s unnecessary congestion from foulings of the Coast Main Line, 3) help new high speed rail facilities fit in smoothly, and 4) allow select trains to bypass Union Station into the near at speed. Done wrong, the project will create a new obstacle that locks Union Station into an ever-worsening scenario that will "lock-in" the future and block high speed rail, and require demolition of the very things you are now planning. I found no evidence in the 2 inch thick volume you these run-through tracks are meant to be a temporary project!

So I really don't understand why the more common-sense solution was not considered. Why you look so much space to document all the historic industrial buildings that might be saved, but ignored an historic run-through tracks solution that should have been the "breadwinner", the first Alternative on the table, and might become the Preferred Alternative! Perhaps because of your lack of consideration for a long-term planning window (100 years), or because of certain political real estate acquisitions in front of the proposed (near shove off) right-of-way? Maybe because unlike highway development (that would achieve the boldest, most direct solution), knowledge in railroading has diminished since its heyday after WWII. Or because turf battles between agencies such as yours fail to recognize the need for holistic, cooperative, multi-agency solutions. Or because your focus was on the problems rather than big solutions regarding Constraints & Related Projects (1-2 & 1-3/7 All Concepts code priority to the street grid, accommodating displaced industrial buildings in the area, not what's best for railroads or future rail & transit riders) Your final Alternatives were hard to cross over M.T.A.'s Red Line again and work around its subway headframe, that act even necessary! In any case, the wide range of similar Concepts led to 2 mutually-offering Alternatives you propose that will create a permanent new barrier that works against the advantages run-through tracks are supposed to create.

Problem: by choosing L.A.U.S.'s westerly tracks to run-through, then curving them sharply east to hug the south bank of the I-10 freeway, you block ever making run-through tracks out of any of the station tracks in the future! With your plan, progressing eastward run-through tracks would need to be increasingly sharper or steeper to meet or cross above the run-throughs. Their combined width would fold the higher-numbered tracks parallel to and over the

13-1

13-2

Response to Letter 13

Comment 13-1

The Run-Through Tracks Project was developed to help address the long-term need for commuter rail service. As explained in Chapter 1 Purpose & Need, Section 4.1 the project is intended to increase the capacity of Union Station to accommodate planned growth of Amtrak and SCRRRA train services. The number of trains using the station is forecasted to grow from 9 today to 223 by 2000 and 20 by 2025. Initial analysis indicated that acceptable levels of service reliability could be provided by the current facilities only through about 2000. The proposed alignments were developed to meet project needs while minimizing environmental impacts (which includes effects to streets and buildings) and avoiding impacts on other transportation projects. The 2025 forecast is the most current and reflects the adopted long-range transportation plan for Amtrak and SCRRRA. Forecasts for potential train needs beyond that date are not available. Regardless, the proposed run-through tracks provide operational capabilities that will serve Union Station needs beyond the 2025 planning horizon used in the EIR/EIS.

Comment 13-2

All tracks at Union Station were evaluated for their potential to provide run-through capabilities in a study conducted in a Project Study Report (PSR) prepared for the California Department of Transportation in June 2000.

Comment Letter 13

Response to Letter 13

freeway. You tell us we will be extending much harder to engineer & maintain to back track simple station! By the time you reach Tracks 15 & 17, they could never be built as run-throughs. To prevent tearing it all out again, is a serious waste of future budget!

Solution: introduce an alternative (can we call it "Alternative E'") a direct diagonal alignment from the south end of Union Station's existing platforms (similar to the north end of Alternative B) returning to the Coast Line at 1st Street (similar to the south end of Alternative D), but straightening out the link in both B & D. All Union Station tracks would be completed as a double-ended yard in a manner similar to Figure 3-5.22 "Historic Plan for Double-End or Through Trains" (page 3-5.70), with the following 21st Century adjustments:

1) Plan all tracks to extend straight across the 101 freeway in a straight line; begin the curve tangents on the south embankment of the 101. This would allow incremental construction of spans straight across the 101 allowing pedestrian access across, and some light and air between them, while building just the few tracks needed for this project now without blocking all of them eventually.

2) South of Union Station (the last great station of the 20th Century) is the most debris place to put the new California High Speed Rail Terminal (that may be the first great station of the 21st). Even though only 2 may be built now, all 17 tracks should be preliminarily planned to run through to 1st Street for a new aerial station, in L.A.U.S.-South, expanding the capacity of existing L.A.U.S. to a project similar to an airport. Alternative E' maximizes straight-aways that would deliver the current-free platforms well over 1,200 feet long that CA.H.S.R. requires. I don't think Alternatives A-D can't! At grade, a bus transit center (including ThruWay and Greyhound), and parking area beneath needed for CA.H.S.R., patrons will require clearing most of the area of buildings. Perhaps significant historic ones can be adapted or moved. Please mention in your report that while these priorities have until recently been underutilized/developed or unbuilt, suddenly graded is already being into the project area make buyouts too expensive) is the crucial moment but all permits in the project area, and to condition and acquire this land for the extending necessity of future transit links. The final E.U.R./E.L.S. should delineate and target number of ongoing land re-development projects (on Alameda), and buildings by Coakley and 8, determining the view, engineering the function and future on very campus of Union Station & the former Post Office Annex today.

2A) Though I don't believe draconian measures can make our pedestrian-oriented transportation facilities completely "secure", I am surprised there is no demand from the Office of Homeland Security, were they on your list for Notices of Preparation? Such an element would surely recommend demolition of the warehouse buildings being constructed in Union Station's "front yard" whose occupants & residents will make Union Station their lounge and living room!

3) Straightening the S-turn to a single diagonal will reduce maintenance even if CA.H.S.R. does not use that area... MetroLink + Amtrak may want it.
 4) This may well be the best place for M.T.A.'s long-overdue "downtown connector" in light rail (LRV) mode to bypass the forced transfer from Blue to Red Lines between 7th & Flower and Union Station. While tracks 1 & 2 (now used by M.T.A.'s Gold Line LRV) does not greatly impact this project now, the future of run-through tracks/ highway 101 spans could be impacted in the big picture: a crossover bridge could be completely eliminated if the Gold Line were immediately brought down south on Alameda from the Chinatown station, stopping in front of Union Station instead of curving east to take up tracks 1 & 2 behind it... then running south on Alameda until turning east to an elevated station serving the CA.H.S.R. terminal, before continuing over the 1st Street bridge to Boyle Heights. The downtown connector would probably start west from the CA.H.S.R. station! I believe M.T.A. will reinforce tracks 1 & 2 to MetroLink within the next 10-20 years. The importance to the run through tracks project is your need to assert in this Draft E.U.R./E.L.S. that any 101 overcrossing built by M.T.A. (for the Gold Line East Side) be designed to Amtrak/MetroLink compatible standards, as main line rail will ultimately need to reclaim Tracks 1 & 2 for future main line rail capacity whether or not CA.H.S.R. is built immediately.

The most westerly tracks were found to provide the greatest opportunity to provide run-through capabilities. The PSR did not preclude the demolition of buildings in order to provide the run-through function. All tracks potentially extended across U.S. 101 would need to tie back into the SCRRA main line on the east side of river, so extending all Union Station tracks across would require a series of tie-ins, which would have to be strung along the length of the mainline. Such a string in not practical since they would conflict with structures (e.g., 1st Street Bridge on MTA Red Line maintenance facilities) or with track configurations. The proposed run-through track alignments provide for the forecasted increases of Amtrak and SCRRA trains through 2025 and do not preclude implementation of the state's proposed high-speed rail network or SCAG's proposed regional maglev system, both of which are anticipated to be linked at Union Station.

Comment 13-3

Planning for the Run-Through Tracks Project was coordinated with the conceptual planning for the proposed high-speed rail project. Tracks and platforms for the high-speed rail network are assumed by that project to be at a level above the current tracks and platforms of Union Station that are used by Amtrak and SCRRA and would not be affected by the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project.

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <p>13-2 cont'd</p> | <p>13-3</p> | <p>13-4</p> | <p>13-5</p> | <p>13-6</p> | <p>13-7</p> |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

Response to Comment 13-3 continued:

Comment 13-4

The Related Projects tabulation in Appendix K enumerates the development projects in the study area. Chapter 3, Section 3-0, and Chapter 4 Section 4.0 discuss the relationship of the proposed project and these related projects in light of their environmental impacts. It is not the role of an environmental document to express opinion as to whether projects are "bad." The overall function of the Union Station campus was evaluated in the Alameda District Specific Plan EIR, completed in 2008 including potential visual impacts of planned development. It appears that development of the Union Station campus has been consistent with the Alameda District Specific Plan approved by the City of Los Angeles.

Comment 13-5

Notice of the proposed project and of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was made to the Department of Homeland Security through announcements published in the Federal Register. That department provided no input during the Scoping process, nor in response to notice of the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS. The commenter's suggestion that buildings around Union Station be demolished because of potential security problems is speculative. Security measures for those buildings, including their relationships to Union Station security, are the responsibility of the individual building owners (the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Water District), as coordinated

with the City of Los Angeles Police Department and other applicable security agencies.

Comment 13-6

Trains could not connect on a true diagonal; some curvature would be required to tie back to the SCRRA Main Line tracks. Both Amtrak and SCRRA (Metrolink) have been continually involved in the conceptual design of the proposed Run-Through Tracks Project and are aware of maintenance cost implications. SCRRA provided the design criteria for track design, which in turn affects maintenance costs.

Comment 13-7

MTA's Gold Line service is located on Union Station tracks 1 and 2. The planned Eastside Extension will extend across U.S. 101 on a new bridge just to the west of the proposed run-through tracks bridge, turn west and then be located on Alameda Street, before turning eastward along 1st Street. The concept for the 'Alameda Connector' (cited by the commenter as the downtown connector) would continue LRT service southward along Alameda Street to provide a connection to the Long Beach Blue Line on the south side of downtown Los Angeles. Coordination between SCRRA and MTA regarding tracks utilization in Union Station is ongoing; there are no current plans for tracks 1 and 2 to be converted to SCRRA use. The Run-Through Tracks project includes the reactivation of tracks 1 and 2 so that Union Station will have a total of 6 tracks available for Amtrak intra-city and SCRRA commuter rail operations. The Eastside Extension bridge will be built to LRT weight standards, not commuter rail.

Comment Letter 13

Response to Letter 13

Comment 13-8

Although the Second Screening did not include electrification criteria, the Run-Through Tracks Project does not preclude future electrification.

Comment 13-9

The bridge segment of the Run-Through Tracks Project does not need to function as a passenger platform. The rebuilt Platforms 3 and 4 would be of sufficient length to serve Amtrak and SCRRRA trains (including additional cars). The final design of the bridge segment has not been developed. The image used in the Draft EIR/EIS was intended only to illustrate the scale and massing of the proposed bridge. The Draft EIR/EIS does not report that the outedges (assumed to mean the parapet walls of the structure) would not be built as part of this project. Design coordination with a potential high-speed rail station would depend on whether the two projects are in design and/or construction stages at the same time. Neither project has yet received funding for construction.

Comment 13-10

Amtrak has confirmed that the status of the proposed relocation of the mail facility is in flux. The business plan of Amtrak is subject to further changes; the proposed relocation will remain as a project element.

Comment Letter 13

11/02/2016 15:19 FAX

13-8

5) Contrary to what you declare on 2-2.2a (page 2-30), Alternatives must include electrification considerations, they are not preclus- MetroLink does intend to electricity, and CAHSR will.

6) The "Simulated Bridge" depicted in Figure 3-17.24 (page 3-17.37), a hideous "California style" bridge, likely prevents use as a platform. Done right, this could be a platform, and a stellar "passive advertisement" for rail to attract jaded car commuters below. One cure for this would be an international design competition for the spans at the edges overlooking the 101, whose objective would be expensive yet economical engineering-expressive solution for the freeway span(s). If the outer edges of the spans may not be built in this project, this project should acknowledge and support that possibility that may be folded into a design competition for the new CAHSR station.

13-10

7) The final EIR/EIS should be updated to acknowledge Amtrak C.E.O. David Gunn's announcement the agency is getting out of the Mail and Express (M&E) business. Amtrak should be contacted for information on the timeline & details for this, because they may eliminate or reduce the work related in the EIR/EIS to evaluate M&E operations from Union Station's highest-numbered (westward) track space.

13-11

8) While the level of acknowledgment of MagLev/Booster you have included is acceptable, doing nothing further with the subject is most appropriate. Because of the extensive R&D needed, difficulty with yard & swiftness, its poorly performing precedents (Virginia Tech & Shanghai), the questionable claims/track record/extent of its promoters, and because (like monorails) its technology is incompatible with those networks of steel wheel steel rail or bus/roadway technology we need far more of. A) It's not happening now, and B) its widespread future in Los Angeles is highly speculative.

13-12

In Conclusion, if you would think of solving the whole problem, including getting out of the way of the parts we do not know yet (California High Speed Rail four platform alignments may yet be parallel stacked above L.A.U.S. tracks, or run perpendicular to through tracks in air rights over the 101 freeway) and future growth of MetroLink, and light rail lines -like the long overdue downtown connector- may decimate or change today's track assignments), we must prepare a run-through tracks alternative that maximizes benefits for future main line and high speed railroad operations that won't waste money demolishing things we build shortsightedly today. I would be willing to assist you with that effort.

For better transit, and more of it:

John Jay Utting
John Jay Utting

13-13

P.S. I deeply regret not attending any of your previous public meetings. Because I am a supporter of the run through tracks concept, fellow transit advocates did attend those meetings. I trusted the execution was "in good hands". I would like these comments above included in the record, and to be notified of future opportunities to work with you (By mail please- I'm not a webster).

Response to Comment 13-10 continued:

At this time, the Final EIR/EIS has not been edited to remove this element or the impacts associated with a relocation.

Comment 13-11

The commenter's perspective on m aglev service is noted for the record;no response is necessary.

Comment 13-12

The proposed Run-Through Tracks Project does not preclude implementation of any of the proposed transportation improvements listed by the commenter.



Comment 13-13

These comments are included in the record of the Run-Through Tracks Project EIR/EIS and the commenter has been added to the project mailing list.

Comment Letter 13

11/02/2004 15:29 FAX 00000000

11/02/2004 15:29 FAX 00000000



Comment Letter PH

ORIGINAL

In re the matter of:)
UNION STATION RUN-THROUGH)
TRACKS PROJECT.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

TAKEN ON
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2004

Reporter: KATHLEEN MASNEC
CSR No. 8442

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES
KATHLEEN MASNEC
CHRISTIE HUDSON BOGREN, President
305 North Second Avenue
Eureka, California 95768
(909) 981-1300 (800) 98-DEPOS
www.precisioncourtreporting.com
e-mail: precision@precisioncr.com
info@precisioncr.com

In re the matter of:)
UNION STATION RUN-THROUGH)
TRACKS PROJECT.)

Reporter's transcript of public comments, taken at
1 Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, California, commencing at
4:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 13, 2004, before KATHLEEN
MASNEC, C.S.R. No. 8442.

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES

Comment Letter PH

Response to Letter PH

Comment PH-1

Preference for Alignment A-1 has been noted for the record.

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2004
2 AT 4:00 P.M.
3 ---000---
4
5
6 MS. LEFKOWITZ: My name is Carol Lefkowitz, E-e, "j"
7 as in Frank, k-o-w-i-t-z. I'm with Dynamic Builders. We
8 are the developer and general contractor for the site, and
9 we have permits in hand for a new 65,000 square foot
10 industrial facility that is due to break ground within the
11 next two weeks on 501 North Center Street. That's on the
12 southeast corner of Commercial and Center Street which is
13 directly impacted by Alignment A. The proposed Alignment
14 A would dissect the property.
15 The facility will house a company called
16 Urgent Gear, a sports goods manufacturer, sporting goods,
17 clothing manufacturer, and they will bring 70 employees to
18 the site. So we are directly impacted by one of the
19 proposed alignments and are strongly in favor of between
20 the two options, the Alignment A-1.
21 Our office address is 2114 South Hill Street,
22 Los Angeles, California, 90007. Phone is 213/746-6630.
23 E-mail is carol@dynamicbuilders.com. That's my comments.
24 MR. ROOFIAN: My name is Ramin, R-a-m-i-n, last name
25 is Roofian, R-o-o-f-i-a-n. My company name is Urgent

PH-1

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES

Comment Letter PH

Response to Letter PH

1 Gear, Inc.

2 And my comment is that we just received a letter
3 regarding the two alternative, and we are actually having
4 our permit, we already got the permit and we are cleaning
5 all of the land and we are building 60,000 feet of
6 warehouse and distribution center which is in the
7 empowerment zone which they are going to hire a lot of
8 people and this is where the city want people to hire
9 people, and we have objection to the Alternative A because
10 it passes through our land which we just got the permit
11 and was ready to be built on, and we'd like to ask for
12 Alternative A-1. This is the one that we are going to
13 recommend because it passes through a lot of empty lots
14 that's already taken by eminent domain versus Alternative
15 A which needs to destroy a lot of other buildings that
16 already have been built.

17 My address is 1016 East 14th Place, Los Angeles,
18 90021.

19 MR. JACKSON: My name is Ken Jackson with Dynamic
20 Builders. Address is 2114 South Hill Street, Los Angeles,
21 90007.

22 Dynamic Builders is currently acquiring the
23 property on the southwest corner of Center Street and
24 Commercial Street. It is directly impacted by Alternative
25 A. The new 57 million facility that will be built there

5

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES

Comment PH-2

Preference for Alignment A-1 has been noted for the record.

Comment Letter PH

Response to Letter PH

1 has already been permitted by the City of Los Angeles and
2 we will commence construction within the next 30 days.

3 The seller Conoco Phillips Petroleum has just completed a
4 \$2 million environmental remediation in preparation for
5 the sale, and the city has already issued the building
6 permit. The property tax base for the city is going to go
7 from roughly 1 and a half million to over 7 million, which
8 is a very important financial matter the city needs to
9 consider.

10 In addition, the city council office has already
11 supported this development in its permitting process with
12 infrastructure improvements that the city has waived as an
13 incentive for Urgent Gear, the ultimate customer, to move
14 into this property.

15 From our viewpoint, it appears that Alternative
16 A-1 is less of an impact on all of the private property
17 owners and more specifically less of an impact on most
18 expensive and valuable of the private properties that are
19 impacted.

20 MR. HOTCHKISS: Dwight Hotchkiss, D-W-I-g-h-t
21 H-o-t-c-h-k-i-s-s, 601 South Figueroa Street, 47th floor,
22 L.A., 90017.

23 I'm a representative for Conoco Phillips which is
24 the owner of a private parcel that's being considered in
25 one of the alternatives. Conoco Phillips was unaware of

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES

Comment PH-3

Preference for Alignment A-1 has been noted for the record.

Comment PH-4

All affected property owners have been notified throughout the duration of the project planning process. They have received direct mail notices, newspaper advertisements, and hand delivery of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and Statement.

Preference for Alignment A-1 has been noted for the record.

PH-3

PH-4

6

Comment Letter PH

Response to Letter PH

PH-4
conf'd

1 the scope of this project going through their site and has
2 requested me to recommend Alternative A-1.

3 We are due to close escrow to a developer who is
4 going to develop a new 67,000 square foot building on the
5 site, and it will commence construction in the next 30
6 days. So as a representative for Conoco Phillips, we are
7 recommending A-1.

8 MR. RUBEN: Ken Ruben.. 4333 Duquesne Avenue,
9 Apartment E, Calver City, zip 92232.

10 This project should be funded as soon as feasibly
11 possible. It will help Amtrak and Metrolink trains
12 schedule wise and is long overdue, and the only problem is
13 getting the funding completed through the legislative
14 process.

15 MR. CLIFTON: James Clifton, C-1-i-f-t-o-n, 13130 3/4
16 Valleyheart, Studio City, 91604.

17 And the only thing is union station has needed
18 this since 1939, and particularly since they started
19 putting trains from San Diego up north through trains.
20 It's better late than never. It's time to get it built.

(End of public comments.)

7

PRECISION COURT REPORTING SERVICES

Comment PH-5

Preference for Alignment A-1 has been noted for the record.

Comment PH-6

Support for the proposed project has been noted for the record.

Comment PH-7

Support for the proposed project has been noted for the record.

CHAPTER 11 - CLARIFICATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

11-1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to enumerate revisions and clarifications to the Draft Environmental Impact Report and Statement (DEIR/DEIS) that was issued on September 3, 2004. The DEIR/DEIS is composed of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and Statement, and Technical Appendices. The revisions and clarifications are intended to correct factual errors (such as a misstated date) or to make discussions presented in the DEIR/DEIS more clear. The changes listed include revisions and clarifications that were called out in Chapter 2: Comments and Responses to Comments, as well as items noted by the Lead Agency. Typographical or grammatical matters that do not change the meaning of discussions or conclusions reported in the DEIR/DEIS are not listed.

11-2 REVISIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO THE DEIR

The following list is provided to direct the reader to the pages where revisions and clarifications to the DEIR were made.

| Chapter | Page |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Inside Cover | 1 |
| Preface | 1 |
| Executive Summary | ES-4 and ES-5 |
| | ES-7 |
| | ES-9 |
| | ES-11 and ES-12 |
| | ES-16 and ES-17 |
| | ES-19 through ES-21 |
| | ES-42 |
| | ES-44 through ES-47 |
| Chapter 1 | 1-7 |
| | 1-10 and 1-11 |
| | 1-14 through 1-16 |

| Chapter | Page |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Chapter 2 | 2-47 |
| | 2-49 |
| | 2-55 |
| | 2-66 |
| | 2-69 |
| | 2-76 and 2-77 |
| Chapter 3, Section 3-1 | 3-1.1 |
| | 3-1.3 through 3-1.5 |
| | 3-1.7 |
| | 3-1.12 and 3-1.13 |
| Section 3-2 | 3-2.16, |
| Section 3-5 | 3-5.45 and 3-5.46 |
| | 3-5.74 |
| | 3-5.76 |
| | 3-5.78 |
| Section 3-12 | 3-12.6 |
| Section 3-15 | 3-15.25 |
| Chapter 4 | 4-21 and 4-22 |
| Chapter 5 | 5-3 and 5-4 |
| | 5-6 |
| Chapter 6 | 6-1 |
| | 6-32 |
| Chapter 7 | 7-1 and 7-9 through 7-36 |
| Chapter 12 | 12-21 |

Phase I Hazardous Materials Study

The Phase I Hazardous Materials Study was not printed with the draft EIR/EIS document due to size. It is available from the Department upon request.

Draft Relocation Impact Memorandum

The Draft Relocation Impact Memorandum was not printed with the draft EIR/EIS document. It is now included in this chapter of the final EIR/EIS.

SHPO Consultation Letters

SHPO letter of January 4 2004 was not printed with the draft EIR/EIS document. It is now included at the end of this chapter of the final EIR/EIS. The responses to issues raised are addressed within a letter dated January 4 2005 also included at the end of this chapter.

Additions to Appendices

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM

State of California

Business Transportation and Housing Agency

Memorandum

TO: Ronald J. Kosinski
 Caltrans District 7/ Deputy Director

Date: December 16, 2004
 File: 7-LA-101-KP4.5/8.5 (PM2.8/5.3) - EA987903

FROM: Department of Transportation – Los Angeles and Ventura Counties/District 7
 Right of Way Relocation Assistance

SUBJECT: Draft Relocation Impact Memorandum

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has proposed a project that would extend two rail tracks south of their current terminus at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) on an aerial structure over U.S. 101, through a commercial/industrial area between U.S. 101 and First Street, and connecting to main line tracks on the west side of the Los Angeles River. For the purposes of environmental analysis, a general study area has been defined within which all alignment variations and physical and operational changes would occur. That general study area is bounded on the north by Leroy Street, which coincides with the location of Mission Tower and where the connecting tracks to LAUS now link to the BNSF main line. The eastern boundary is the Los Angeles River, which adjoins the east side of the railroad right-of-way of the BNSF main line. The western boundary is Alameda Street/North Main. The southern boundary is 4th Street.

Within the general study area, the area of potential construction would be between LAUS/U.S. 101 and 1st Street. Within the boundaries of the LAUS complex, changes would occur related to the configuration of tracks and platforms, and to provide accessibility improvements. It is anticipated that platform number 2, serving track numbers 3 and 4, would be elevated about five feet as part of the proposed project. Preliminary design work indicated that these tracks and their platform would need to be raised in order for there to be sufficient vertical clearance of the El Monte Busway, which is immediately adjacent to the south end of LAUS. Gaining additional vertical height within LAUS also enhances the ability to cross over the US 101 freeway. North of LAUS, there would be changes within railroad right-of-way, but no activities outside of the right-of-way are foreseen.

The total distance of the proposed track changes is expected to be less than 2 miles. The proposed track structures would be constructed at a height that provides for 16 feet-6 inches of clearance over all roadways, 19 feet-6 inches of clearance over the Eastside Light Rail Transit line or its lead tracks, and 26 feet of clearance over the freight railroads. The proposed structure would be about six feet in depth (and thus added to the above stated clearances), but could be shallower or deeper depending on engineering considerations.

There are two proposed alternatives. Both alternatives would cross U.S. 101 from LAUS. After crossing the freeway, Alternative A would run on a viaduct over parcels just south of Commercial Street. Alternative A-1 would also run on a viaduct, but on parcels just north of Commercial Street, after crossing over the freeway. Both alternatives would then basically form an S-curve that would come back down to grade near the east end of Jackson Street and tie into existing BNSF tracks. Acquisitions of public and/or private parcels would be required, based on the selected alignment.

The City of Los Angeles' Central City North Community Plan designates LAUS as a regional commercial land use and a cultural/historical site. The Central City North Community Plan designates several land uses within the project area. The designated land uses include: community commercial (height district 2), residential commercial, commercial industrial (height district 1), light industrial (height district 1), heavy industrial (height district 1), and public facilities.

A field review of the proposed project area was conducted to determine the potential impact on residential and non-residential properties. Alternative A would require the acquisition and displacement of one business, a warehouse facility. In addition, Alternative A would require the acquisition of aerial easements from two other businesses, both parking lots. Alternative A-1 would displace a business involved in manufacturing and would require acquisition of an aerial easement from another business, a parking lot. A complete discussion of the properties affected by the proposed alternatives is provided in Chapter 3-1, Acquisitions and Displacements, of the EIS/EIR. Tables 1 and 2, included in the Attachments section, summarize the property acquisitions associated with each of the project alternatives. Figures 1 and 2, also in Attachments, show the locations of the property acquisitions associated with each of the project alternatives.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM

The businesses affected by the proposed project may need to be relocated outside of the immediate area. Once environmental clearance has been completed, and an appraisal has been approved, Caltrans will make an offer. Once an offer has been made, Relocation Assistance will contact the property owner, explain their benefits, and offer assistance to locate a replacement site.

In addition to providing the appropriate financial assistance to help in the relocations, Caltrans will also provide assistance in finding suitable replacement sites. Property owners will be encouraged to actively participate in finding a replacement property of their choice. If a suitable replacement property is not found, Caltrans may need to compensate businesses and non-profit organizations.


Any person who moves from real property or moves personal property from real property as a result of the acquisition of the real property, or is required to relocate as a result of a written notice from the California Department of Transportation from the real property required for a transportation project is eligible for relocation Assistance. All activities will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (Uniform Act). Relocation resources shall be available to all displacees free of discrimination.

Since relocation assistance benefits would be available under the Uniform Act, the numbers of affected properties is very small and because adequate relocation opportunities exist, it has been determined there would no significant impact to property owners, tenants, or businesses.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL


Lynn V. Nam
Right of Way Agent

APPROVED:


Daniel M. Dunn, Chief
Right of Way Relocation Assistance Program

C: Region/District RW DDC
Region/District P&M

Attachments

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM

Table 1: Alternative A Affected Properties

| APN # | Address | Owner (1) | Use | Acquisition | Displacement |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 5173-003-009 | 531 E. Commercial St | PBR Realty, LLC (2) | Parking lot | Easement (2) | No (2) |
| 5173-002-010 | 527 E. Commercial St | Chris Chen (3) | Parking lot | Easement (3) | No (3) |
| 5173-003-010 | 620 E. Commercial St | PBR Realty, LLC | Warehouse | Full | Yes |
| 5173-017-004 | 706 E. Commercial St | Keller Street Development Co. | Parking lot | Full | Yes |
| 5173-017-006 | 711 Ducommun St | Friedman Investments, LLC | Warehouse | Aerial easement | No |
| 5173-017-008 | None | Conoco Phillips | Vacant lot (5) | Full | No |
| 5173-020-010 | None | Richard and Bonnie Viertel | Parking lot | Full | Yes |
| 5173-020-910 | None | LA County MTA | Red Line portal | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |
| 5173-020-907 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant lot | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |
| 5173-020-906 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant lot | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |
| 5173-021-902 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant lot | N/A (4) | N/A (4) |

Notes:

- Owner as reflected in Win2Data as of June 1, 2003.
- For the purposes of this analysis, the owner of this parcel is assumed to be the California State Department of Transportation (Department) due to their anticipated purchase of the property as a required acquisition for their Route 101 Ramp Realignment Project. Therefore, no displacement of persons or businesses would occur. A construction easement may be required.
- For the purposes of this analysis, the owner of this parcel is assumed to be the LA County MTA due to their anticipated purchase of the property as a required acquisition for their proposed MTA Yard Lead Project. Therefore, no displacement of persons or businesses would occur. A construction easement may be required.
- These parcels are already owned by the LA County MTA, therefore, no acquisitions are required. A construction easement may be required.
- This parcel is currently vacant. However, pursuant to case #DIR-2003-5815-SPR, conditional approval to build a 57,320 sq. ft. warehouse building with 11,104 sq. ft. of office space was approved on November 04, 2003.

Source: Win2Data, 2003; Myra L. Frank/Jones & Stokes, 2004.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM

Figure 1: Parcels to be Acquired for Alignment A



Source: Copyright 2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors, Rel. 10/2002; City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA – DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM

Table 2: Alternative A-1 Affected Properties

| APN # | Address | Owner (1) | Land Use | Acquisition | Displacement |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 5173-003-009 | 531 E. Commercial St | PBR Realty LLC (2) | Parking lot | Easement (2) | No (2) |
| 5173-018-001 | 516 Aliso St | PBR Realty LLC | Vacant | Full | No |
| 5173-019-006 | 801 E. Commercial St | Friedman Bag Company Inc. | Heavy industrial | Full | Yes |
| 5173-020-907 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |
| 5173-020-905 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |
| 5173-020-010 | 500 Center Street | Bonnie and Richard Viertel | Impound lot | Full | Yes |
| 5173-020-902 | 840 E. Commercial St | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |
| 5173-021-902 | None | LA County MTA | Vacant | N/A (3) | N/A |

Notes:

1. Owner as reflected in Win2Data as of June 1, 2003.
2. For the purposes of this analysis, the owner of this parcel is assumed to be the Department due to its anticipated purchase of the property as a required acquisition for their U.S. 101 Ramp Realignment Project. Therefore, no displacements of persons or businesses would occur. A construction easement from the Department may be required.
3. The parcels are already owned by MTA.

Source: Win2Data, 2003; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., 2003.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAFT RELOCATION IMPACT MEMORANDUM

Figure 2: Parcels to be Acquired for Alignment A-1



Source: Copyright 2003 GDT, Inc. and its licensors. Ref. 10/2002; City of Los Angeles, 2002; Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc.

APPENDIX A. CONSULTATION WITH SHPO

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - THE RESOURCES AGENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

P.O. BOX 942895
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001
(916) 653-6624 Fax (916) 653-9124
caohpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov



January 15, 2004

REPLY TO: FRA031117A

Ronald Kosinski, District Director *RK*
Division of Environmental Planning
California State Department of Transportation, District 7
120 S. Spring Street
Mail Stop #16-A
LOS ANGELES CA 90012

Re: Historic Property Survey Report and Finding of No Adverse Effect Report for the Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project, Los Angeles, Los Angeles County.

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

Thank you for submitting to our office, on behalf of the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), your November 3, 2003 letter, Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) and Finding of No Adverse Effect (FNAE) documentation regarding the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County. FRA, in conjunction with AMTRAK, is proposing to extend the tracks from the existing stub-end tracks at Los Angeles Union Station (Union Station) to provide "run-through" capabilities for four of the ten stub-end tracks at the station. Union Station is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

The extension would involve construction of a railroad bridge span over the El Monte Busway and U.S. 101. The elevated rail structure would continue south then east from U.S. 101, forming an S-curve that would transition to grade and reconnect to the existing Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) mainline tracks along the west bank of the Los Angeles River, north of the 1st Street Bridge. This would allow some of the trains that use Union Station to avoid the current pull-in/back out situation. The project may also require some reconfiguration of the Union Station passenger platforms, changes in pedestrian access at the tunnel level, possibly depressing the baggage handling access road at the south end of the station, ADA improvements to pedestrian ramps and stairways, as well as relocation and installation of utilities. Two alternatives (Alternative A and Alternative A-1) are under consideration for this undertaking. They are described in detail on Page 7 of the HPSR and Page 6 of the FNAE documentation. The proposed Areas of Potential Effects (APEs), as delineated for both proposed alternatives, appear adequate and meet the definition set forth in 36 CFR 800.16(d).

FRA is seeking my comments on its determination of the eligibility of eight (8) pre-1957 architectural properties located within the proposed project APEs for inclusion on the NRHP in accordance with 36 CFR 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The HPSR also identified six (6) post-1957 architectural properties within

the project APE and determined them ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP. I do not object to FRA's finding regarding these six (6) post-1957 properties. The HPSR also identified six properties located within the proposed project APEs that are either listed on, or have been determined, by consensus, to be eligible for inclusion on, the NRHP. I have no objection to these properties retaining their current NRHP eligibility status. The documentation also identifies two archeological properties that were located within the project APEs. These properties are:

- CA-LAN-1575/H - a site containing both prehistoric components and extensive historic-era components.
- AE-UPT-01H - an industrial lead track constructed between 1894 and 1906 to serve the no longer extant Maier & Zobelein Brewery which was located at the northwest corner of Commercial and Vignes Streets.

A review of the HPSR leads me to concur with FRA's determination regarding the aforementioned pre-1957 architectural properties:

- The Mission Tower located at 1436 Alhambra Avenue is eligible for inclusion on the NRHP at the level of local significance under Criteria A and C as defined in 36 CFR 60.4. The structure has strong associations with the operation and monitoring of train traffic at Union Station and was an integral part of the station's operations in the historic period spanning the years 1916 to 1996. The structure has maintained sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, and feeling associated with its historic period of significance.
- None of the remaining 7 pre-1957 architectural properties are eligible for inclusion on the NRHP under any of the criteria established by 36 CFR 60.4. The properties have no strong associations with significant historical events or persons and are not examples of outstanding architectural or engineering design or function.

Regarding the aforementioned archeological properties I have the following comments:

- **CA-LAN-1575/H -**

I have not found evidence that SHPO concurred with any previous determination of NRHP eligibility for this property. If you have documentation attesting to SHPO concurrence, please provide it as soon as possible. I agree that there is a high potential that portions of this site extend into the current project's APE.

- **Site AE-UPT-01H -**

The documentation states the property appears eligible to the National Register under Criterion D because it may yield information about the materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. The report does not include a research design that explains the information this property may contain, nor does it contain an explanation of why understanding more about materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks is considered important in any specific

historic context. Absent this information, I at this time unable to concur in this eligibility determination.

FRA is also seeking my comments on its determination of the effects the proposed project alternatives will have on historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 800. My review of the submitted FOE documentation leads me to concur with FRA on the following:

- The proposed project alternatives, as described, would have no adverse effect on the following National Register-eligible architectural properties:
 - Los Angeles Union Station
 - Los Angeles Union Station Tower (Terminal Tower)
 - Macy Avenue/Cesar Chavez Avenue Bridge
 - Vignes Street Bridge
 - 1st Street Viaduct
 - Mission Tower
 - Car Supply/Repair Shop
 - AT&SF Railway Redondo Junction Master Mechanic & Locomotive Supervisors Offices

The proposed project alternatives will not significantly alter or change those characteristics that qualify these properties for inclusion on the NRHP. In addition, numerous alterations that have occurred at Union Station as a result of the El Monte Busway Extension project in 1987 and the Metro Rail Line project in 1991 have introduced elements that have slightly altered the property's historic design, materials, and setting associated with its 1939 appearance. It is these modified elements that the proposed project is designed to have the greatest impact on.

The FOE documentation concludes there is a high potential that CA-LAN-1575/H, AE-UPT-01, and possibly other as yet unknown archaeological deposits may all be subject to adverse effects during construction of this undertaking. It does appear that there is a potential for an adverse effect to these properties should they be determined or considered National Register eligible. The report proceeds to recommend measures to mitigate the prospective adverse effect of this undertaking. It recommends preparing a *Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered during Project Implementation* that will discuss how FRA will resolve any adverse effects upon newly discovered properties that may be historic during the implementation of the project. I would like to review this document as part of our Section 106 consultation. The FOE identifies six mitigation measures that could be included in an MOA. I recommend these mitigation measures be addressed in the proposed Treatment Plan. The specific details of mitigation measure CR-1 (how and when archaeological resources will be identified, evaluated, and treated) are crucial to appropriate compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Other mitigation measures suggest avoidance will be considered. If identification and evaluation of historic properties will truly proceed apace with construction, it seems that avoidance is not a realistic option. The proposed Treatment Plan should discuss only reasonable options to mitigate adverse effects to prospective historic properties within the APE for this undertaking.

FRA has indicated on Pages 12 and 13 of its HPSR that it has held scoping meetings with, and written letters to, local government agencies and interested parties in period dating from June 2002 to January 2003. As of September 2003, FRA received no written responses to its letters from the interested parties listed on the aforementioned pages of the HPSR. It is unclear whether this lack of written responses to FRA's letters constitutes the full range of possible responses from interested parties that would verify their concurrence or non-concurrence with the project and its potential effects on historic properties. Please provide, at your earliest possible convenience, any additional evidence or information that would convey the views of the aforementioned interested parties about the proposed project and its impact on historic properties.

Thank you again for seeking my comments on your project. If you have any questions, please contact staff historian Clarence Caesar by phone at (916) 653-8902, or by e-mail at ccaes@ohp.parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Dr. Knox Mellon
State Historic Preservation Officer

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7
Division of Environmental Planning
100 S. SPRING STREET, MS 15A
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3506
PHONE (213) 897-0703
FAX (213) 897-0685
TTY (213) 897-4937



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

January 14, 2005

Milford Wayne Donaldson, AIA
State Historic Preservation Officer
Office of Historic Preservation
Department of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Dear Mr. Donaldson:

Thank you for your review and comments on the Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR) and Finding of No Adverse Effect (FOE) for the proposed Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project in the City of Los Angeles.

In the SHPO letter dated January 15, 2004, no objection was made to the findings in the HPSR, which indicate that the Mission Tower is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and that six post-1957 properties are not eligible for the NRHP. Furthermore, SHPO stated no objection to six properties identified within the APE as previously listed or eligible retaining their current eligibility status.

In regards to comments from interested parties, your letter stated: "FRA has indicated on Pages 12 and 13 of its HPSR that it has held scoping meetings with, and written letters to, local government agencies and interested parties in the period dating from June 2002 to January 2003. As of September 2003, FRA received no written responses to its letters from the interested parties listed on the aforementioned pages of the HPSR. It is unclear whether this lack of responses to FRA's letters constitutes the full range of possible responses from interested parties that would verify their concurrence or non-concurrence with the project and its potential effects on historic properties. Please provide, at your earliest possible convenience, any additional evidence or information that would convey the views of the aforementioned interested parties about the proposed project and its impact on historic properties."

In the two years since the letters to government agencies and interested parties were sent out on behalf of FRA, no written responses or comments in any other form have been received in regard to historic properties. There were no comments on historic issues received during the recent circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS (September 9 to October 20, 2004.). Each of the agencies and parties listed on pages 12 and 13 of the HPSR received a copy of the Draft EIR/EIS or a Notice of Availability. If any comments are received before, during or after circulation of the DEIS, FRA would notify you immediately. *(continued)*

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Milford Wayne Donaldson, AIA
State Historic Preservation Officer
January 14, 2005
Page 2

SHPO also concurred that the proposed project would have no adverse effect on the eight NRHP-listed or -eligible architectural properties within the APE, which includes Los Angeles Union Station.

Archaeological Property CA-LAN-1575/H

The SHPO letter offered comments regarding two archaeological properties reported in the HPSR. Regarding multi-component archaeological site CA-LAN-1575/H, SHPO stated: "I have not found evidence that SHPO concurred with any previous determination of NRHP eligibility for this property. If you have documentation attesting to SHPO concurrence, please provide it as soon as possible. I agree that there is a high potential that portions of this site extend into the current project's APE."

This site encompasses the area surrounding Union Station south of Macy Street, west of Vignes Street, east of U.S. 101 and east of Alameda Street, and was first recorded in 1989 in association with discoveries of historic-era cultural remains made during monitoring and excavation for the Metro Rail Project. In 1996, excavations at CA-LAN-1575/H for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's Headquarters building exposed numerous historic-era features, and a prehistoric cemetery.

After further review, FRA determined that no evidence has been found that SHPO has been directly and clearly asked to concur with an eligibility determination for CA-LAN-1575/H. Excavations in historical deposits and the Native American cemetery for the MWD Headquarters Building in 1996 were performed to Section 106 standards, however, the subject project was conducted under CEQA, and SHPO was not involved. Reports for earlier project, e.g., the Metro Red Line Segment One, discuss a Memorandum of Agreement that included the SHPO (Greenwood 1993:1). This report further states that "Union Station itself is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for its architectural and historical values. The entire block is now recognized as significant under NRHP Criterion A (association with a pattern of events significant to the cultural traditions of a community); and Criterion D, as an historic archaeological property that has been partially excavated, has yielded important data, and still retains substantial and intact deposits."

It appears that SHPO was never asked to concur with this eligibility determination for CA LAN 1575/H, rather it was assumed that the site was already eligible as part of the Union Station complex.

Archaeological Property 19-003169

The second archaeological property mentioned in your letter was site 19-003169, a set of railroad tracks within the Project APE, recorded as a historical archaeological site in 2003. The HPSR stated that Site 19-003169 did not appear individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for two reasons: (1) it was not built at the same time as the main line and therefore lacks sufficient direct association with the history of the AT&SF, and (2) it lacks integrity of setting, feeling and association because the original industrial building it served no longer exists.

(continued)

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Milford Wayne Donaldson, AIA
State Historic Preservation Officer
January 14, 2005
Page 3

However, historical archaeological site 19-003169 was recommended as potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion D, as an archaeological site that may be likely to yield information important in history, specifically about the materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. Further study was necessary because a complete evaluation of the resource's integrity and significance cannot be performed prior to construction.

In the letter dated January 15, 2004, SHPO made the following statement: "The documentation states the property appears eligible to the National Register under Criterion D because it may yield information about the materials and location of typical industrial leads tracks associated with a precursor of the AT&SF Railway. The report does not include a research design that explains the information this property may contain, nor does it contain an explanation of why understanding more about materials and location of typical industrial lead tracks is considered important in any specific historic context. Absent this information, I, at this time, am unable to concur in this eligibility determination."

Previous excavations around railroad lines in Los Angeles, (i.e. the Alameda Corridor project) have recovered several previously unknown subsurface features associated with railroad construction and use. The SHPO is correct in stating that a research design regarding historic railroads and railroad features has not been prepared, and lacking this context, it is difficult to evaluate railroad resources. The proposed eligibility evaluation for 19-003169 presented is cautious, in case sites do provide information as part of a larger universe of historic-era railroad-related research issues.

It should be noted that since preparation of the FOE, a portion of the alignment of Alternative A (the block bounded by Commercial, N. Garey, Ducommun and N. Hewitt streets) has been acquired and development of a new commercial structure begun. This commercial site is within of the boundary of site 19-003169. Although a preferred alternative has not been selected, this construction along Alternative A appears likely to lead to a selection of Alternative A-1, which lies north of Commercial Street, as the preferred alignment. The only portion of site 19-003169 that has been identified to date is in the pavement of Commercial Street in the block between Garey and N. Hewitt Streets and would not be affected under Alternative A. Any portion of the site not yet documented that might extend north of Commercial Street would be potentially affected under Alternative A, and would therefore be subject to the Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) discussed below.

Mitigation of Effects on Archaeological Properties CA-LAN-1575/H and 19-003169

The SHPO commented that: "The FOE documentation concludes there is a high potential that CA-LAN-1575/H, Site 19-003169, and possibly other as yet unknown archaeological deposits, may all be subject to adverse effects during construction of this undertaking. It does appear that there is a potential for an adverse effect to these properties should they be determined or considered National Register eligible. The report proceeds to recommend measures to mitigate the prospective adverse effect of this undertaking. It recommends preparing a Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered during Project Implementation that will discuss how FRA will resolve any adverse effects upon newly discovered properties that may be historic during the implementation of this project." (continued)

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"


Milford Wayne Donaldson, AIA
State Historic Preservation Officer
January 14, 2005
Page 4

SHPO requested the opportunity to review this document as part of Section 106 consultation. The SHPO letter further states: "The FOE identifies six mitigation measures that could be included in the MOA. I recommend these mitigation measures be addressed in the proposed Treatment Plan. The specific details of mitigation measure CR-1 (how and when archaeological resources would be identified evaluated and treated) are crucial to appropriate compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation act. Other mitigation measures suggest avoidance will be considered. If identification and evaluation of historic properties will truly proceed apace with construction, it seems that avoidance is not a reasonable option. The proposed Treatment Plan should only discuss reasonable options to mitigate adverse effects to prospective historic properties within the APE for this undertaking."

To ensure that the effects of the proposed project on the Union Station historic property are mitigated to less than significant, the State Historic Preservation Officer will be consulted by the lead agency, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA); the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and interested Native American groups will be offered an opportunity to participate; and a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) will be drafted that would provide mechanisms to minimize harm to any historic property, primarily through treatment, design review, comment, and design revision. This MOA will stipulate that a Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) will be prepared for the Project prior to construction. To more efficiently implement archaeological testing, evaluation, and site mitigation in areas of the Project alignments, portions of which are presently accessible, as discussed below, a draft HPTP has been prepared for future incorporation into the MOA. FRA proposes to use the HPTP for all historic properties discovered during construction. The draft HPTP is attached for your review and comment. Please note that the draft HPTP has been modeled on the HPTP prepared for the FTA/BART Warm Springs Extension LRT Project.

In the general context of prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, resolution of potential adverse effect usually involves site avoidance or mitigation through excavation and additional research. In the present case, avoidance is not an option because of the massive nature of the proposed construction and tight grade and turning constraints of the S-shaped the rail structure that are necessary to link Union Station to the SCRRA Mainline tracks. Potential adverse impacts to cultural resources can be mitigated by measures implemented during the construction process. Implementing the mitigation measures stipulated in the EIR/EIS and documented in the proposed MOA will result in compliance with Section 106 regulations regarding assessment and treatment of known cultural resources, as well as assessment and treatment of subsequent cultural resources discoveries during the Project.

Sincerely,



GARY IVERSON
Historic Resource Coordinator

c: David Valenstein, Federal Railroad Administration
Richard Starzak, Myra L. Frank/Jones & Stokes

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

CHAPTER 10 - AGENCIES, PERSONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

Andre Amy, Julie Johnson, DTSC Cypress, Stephen Cutts, Pete Cook. June 2003. Department of Toxic Substances Control. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Arturo Aguirre, Administration, Joe Bellomo, Environmental Services, Heidi Sato, Management Information Systems, Arthur Tiltzer, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services. June 2003. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

David Bachorawski, Cindy Flores. June 2003. Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence and issues.

Tina Bencze, Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR). May 2003. Phone Conversation, Hazmat database search.

Diane Benson, Rick Arbar, County Assessor, Jacklyn Neal, Real Estate Division. June 2003. County of Los Angeles. Phone conversation regarding ownership of properties within project area.

Carl Bernhardt, Department of Toxic Substance Control - Geo Tracker. June 2003. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Dr. Charles Blankson, Transportation Specialist. June 2003. South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Section. Phone conversation regarding air emissions, thresholds.

Planning, Bud Corn, Planning, Mrs. Lambert. June 2003. Southern California Edison. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence and issues.

Al Deraby, Property Officer Kim, Mary Allen (Property Supervisor) Los Angeles Police Department. June 2003. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence and issues.

Lupe Gonzales, Don Giddings, LADWP Materials, Joyce Cheng, LADWP Water Quality, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. June 2003. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Valerie Jahn, Department of Toxic Substance Control - Geo Tracker. June 2003. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Felipe Mendoza, Ricy Parcon, Fernando Flores, County Inspector. June 2003. Los Angeles County Fire Department - HAZMAT. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Agencies, Persons, and Organizations Consulted

Michael E. McGinley, Director, Engineering and Construction. METROLINK. March 2003. Southern California Regional Rail Authority. Phone conversations regarding platforms at Union Station.

Gordon Mize, Transportation Specialist. May 2003. South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Section. Phone conversation regarding air emissions, thresholds, CEQA requirements.

Shahin Nourshad, City HAZMAT Supervisor, Virginia Martinez, Public Health Investigation. June 2003. City of Los Angeles. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Rosalia Rojo, Floodplain Manager. May/June 2003. City of Los Angeles. Phone conversation regarding floodplains, flood facilities.

Ken Rowland. June 2003. Sempra Utilities. Phone conversation regarding overhead utility lines, transmission lines.

Jamie Van de Burg, Underground Services, Dan Meltzer, Chemical Environmental, Engineering and Technical Services, Sam Iacono, Materials and Equipment, Engineering and Technical Services. June 2003. Southern California Gas. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

Jim Wells, HAZMAT, Kathy Ainsworth, Fire Department Bureau, Valerie Tony, HAZMAT Unit. June 2003. City Of Los Angeles Fire Department. Phone conversation regarding hazardous materials presence, and issues.

CHAPTER 9 - BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aerial Archives. 2002. Historic Aerial of Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal, 1951.

American Society for Testing and Materials. 2000. Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. ASTM E1527-00.

Amtrak California – Caltrans. www.dot.ca.gov/hq/rail/

Amtrak. September 2002. Los Angeles Union Station Emergency Preparedness Plan.

Amtrak -www.amtrak.com/about/index

Amtrak Reform Council. 2000. A Council Policy Paper, a Summary of Current Legislative Provisions Prescribing the Legal and Regulatory Framework Governing the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak). December 4.

Amtrak. 2001. California Passenger Rail System, 20-year Improvement Plan. March.

Anderson, Carson. 1992. Eastside Industrial Area Architectural and Historical Resources Survey. Los Angeles, CA: City Redevelopment Agency, City of Los Angeles.

Anonymous Articles. “Aliso Street Grade Separation Underway; Cost \$3,500,000.” Southwest Builder & Contractor, pp. 18-20. May 1942. “Aliso Street Bridge Tied into Parkway Projects East of L.A. River.” Southwest Builder & Contractor, pp. 20-24. September 1944. “Aliso Street Viaduct Officially Dedicated.” Southwest Builder & Contractor, pp. 24-28.

Applied EarthWorks, Inc. 2003. (In Preparation) History and Archaeology of the Alameda Corridor. Applied EarthWorks, Inc., Hemet California. Submitted to the Alameda Corridor Transit Authority, Carson, California.

Blake 2000 [in 3-8 Geologic]

Bradley, Bill. 2000. The Last of the Great Stations: Fifty Years of the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal. Special Printing Summer 2000. Pasadena, CA: Pentrex Media Group.

Cahill, Marie and Lynne Piade, eds. 1989. The History of the Union Pacific, America’s Great Transcontinental Railroad. 1989 Edition. New York, NY: Crescent Books.

California Code of Regulations (CCR). June 2003. Standards for Ambient Air Quality. CCR, Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 5, Article 1.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2002. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) Rarefind 2 Database Search. Los Angeles and Hollywood USGS 7.5 minute quadrangles.

- California, State of, Department of Parks and Recreation. 1996. California Historical Landmarks, Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento.
- California Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2003. Geo Tracker Database.
- California, State of, Department of Transportation. 2003. Historic Bridge Inventory, on-line listings of both state and local bridges, www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/historic.html.
- California Department of Transportation, District 8. March 2003. website: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/>.
- California Department of Transportation. 2003. Standard Environmental Reference.
- California Department of Transportation. 1999. Project Development Procedures Manual, Chapter 18 - Hazardous Waste and Appendix DD Initial Site Assessment (ISA) Checklist.
- California Department of Transportation. 1996. California Seismic Hazard Map, Office of Earthquake Engineering.
- California Department of Transportation. January 2002. California State Rail Plan, 2001-02 to 2010-11.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 1961. Bulletin 104, Planned Utilization of the Groundwater Basins of the Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County, Appendix A – Groundwater Geology.
- California Energy Commission. 2003. Website: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/commission/index.html>.
- California Energy Commission. 1996. Electricity Report.
- California Energy Commission. 1995. Fuels Report.
- California Geological Survey (CGS; Formerly known as California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]). 1999. Seismic Hazard Zone Map—Los Angeles Quadrangle, March 1999, 1:24000.
- California Geological Survey (CGS; Formerly known as California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]). 1998. Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Los Angeles 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California, OFR 98-20.
- California Geological Survey (CGS; Formerly known as California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]). 1994. Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas, Scale 1:750,000. Geologic Data Map No. 6.
- California Geological Survey (CGS; Formerly known as California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]). 1994. Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California. Special Publication No. 42.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2002. Online inventory of Rare, Endangered Plants search. 6th Edition. Website: www.cnps.org/rareplants/inventory/submit.htm

California Public Utilities Commission. 2003. Website: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/>.

California Public Utilities Commission. May 7, 2003. Website: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/>.

California Public Utilities Commission, Regulated Areas, Rail Safety and Carriers. 2003. Website: www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/transportation/index.

California Resources Agency. 2002. CERES, California Wetlands Inventory System. Los Angeles River. Website: ceres.ca.gov/wetlands/geo_info/so_cal/los_angeles_river.html.

California Resources Agency. 2002. CERES, California Wetlands Inventory System. Los Angeles River. ceres.ca.gov/wetlands/geo_info/so_cal/los_angeles_river.html.

California Transportation Commission - www.catc.ca.gov.

Catellus Development Corporation. 2002. Union Station Historical Photos: Demolition and Construction for Red Line Station, 1988-1989.

Chinatown Business Improvement District. July 5, 2002. Los Angeles Chinatown Development Projects. Website: http://www.china_townla.com/DevMap.htm.

City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering. 2003. NavigateLA! Website: www.navigatela.lacity.org.

City of Los Angeles. 2002. City Directories. Various years.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety. 2002. Building Permit Archives.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Cultural Affairs. 2003. Historic-Cultural Monuments of Los Angeles.

City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Street Services, Tree Division. 2002. Website: www.lacity.org/boss and publiccsd.lacity.org/CSD.

City of Los Angeles. June 27, 2000. City of Los Angeles Inter-Departmental Correspondence: Proposed Fire Facility Bond Measure for the November 2000 Ballot. Website: <http://www.sf-valley.org/Bonds/f/firebonddata.htm>. Accessed March 2003.

City of Los Angeles. May 14, 1998. Draft L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide.

City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering. January 2003. Proposition F - Fire Facilities Bond. Website: http://eng.lacity.org/projects/fire_bond/index.htm.

City of Los Angeles. 1999. Los Angeles Municipal Code, including the revised (1999) Division 2, Section 2315 of the Building Code.

City of Los Angeles Planning Department. April 1996. Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan.

City of Los Angeles. 1996. Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, adopted November 26, 1996.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2002a. July 2002. National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards. Title 40, CFR, Part 50.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2002b. July 2002. Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans. Title 40, CFR, Part 93, Subpart A and Subpart B.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2002c. July 2002. Control of Emissions from New and In-Use Highway Vehicles and Engines. Title 40, CFR, Part 86.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2002d. July 2002. Control of Air Pollution from Locomotives and Locomotive Engines. Title 40, CFR, Part 92.

Costello, Julia G., and Paul D. Friedman. 1980. Los Angeles Downtown People Mover Program, Archaeological Resources Survey, Phase 2. Science Applications, Inc., La Jolla. Prepared for Community Redevelopment Agency, City of Los Angeles.

Costello, Julia G., Adrian Praetzellis, Mary Praetzellis, Judith Marvin, Michael D. Meyers, Erica S. Gibson, Grace H. Ziesing. 1999. Historical Archaeology at the Headquarters Facility Project Site, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Volume 2, Interpretative Report. On file: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.

County of Los Angeles. 2002. Assessor's Improvement Records.

County of Los Angeles. 1990. Technical Appendix to the Safety Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan—HAZARD REDUCTION in LOS ANGELES COUNTY Volume 1, dated January 1990, by Leighton & Associates.

County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services. January 2003. Website: <http://www.ladhs.org>.

County of Los Angeles Fire Department. 2002. Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance. Website: www.lacofd.org/htm/otordin.htm.

County of Los Angeles Metropolitan Transport Authority (MTA). Website: http://www.mta.net/trans_planning/longrange/LRTP.htm.

Department of the Interior. 1981. Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record. "Los Angeles Union Station Passenger Terminal, Tracks & Sheds."

Diaz-Yourman Associates. 2003. Preliminary Geotechnical Design Information. Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Tracks Project. Los Angeles, California.

Dibblee, T.W. 1989. Geologic map of the Los Angeles Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California, Map No. DF-22, Scale 1:24,000

Dillon, B. D. 1994. Alameda District Plan, Los Angeles, California: Prehistoric and Early Historic Archaeological Research. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California Historical Resources Information System, University of California, Los Angeles.

Downtown Center Los Angeles Business Improvement District. February 25, 2003. Development Projects: Greater Downtown Los Angeles.

DMJM Harris. 2003 Los Angeles Union Station Run-through Tracks Project Utility Report - Draft.

DMJM, PBQD, KE/HWA. 1987. Southern California Rapid Transit District Metro Rail Project Plans. "Union Station Contract."

Duke, Donald and Stan Kistler. 1963. Santa Fe...Steel Rails through California. San Marino, CA: Golden West Books.

Eisentraut, Phyllis. 1996. Site form for Site19-00120014, Merced Theatre Building. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

Environmental Data Resources. May 2003. Area Study Report. City of Los Angeles Site. Inquiry No. 0977271.1s.

Federal Railroad Administration, Passenger Rail - www.fra.dot.gov/rdv/passenger/index.

Federal Railroad Administration. Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. 2002. www.fra.dot.gov/rdv/environmental_impact_assesment/nepa.htm.

Federal Railroad Administration. 2002. http://www.fra.dot.gov/rdv/environmental_impact_assesment/nepa.htm. Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts.

Federal Railroad Administration. May 7, 2003. Website: <http://www.fra.dot.gov>.

Federal Railroad Administration. Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. 2002. Website: www.fra.dot.gov/rdv/environmental_impact_assesment/nepa.htm.

Federal Register. May 23, 2003 (Volume 68, Number 100, page 28327&ff). Proposed Rules, Control of Emissions of Air Pollution From Nonroad Diesel Engines and Fuel.

Foster, John. 2000. Site form for Site19-120014. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

Foster, John and Robin D. Turner. 1997. Site form for Site 19-002563. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

Foster, John and Robin D. Turner. 1997. Site form for Site CA-LAN-2879H. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

Friends of Los Angeles River (FoLAR). 2002. River Watch Studies, Peter Bloom, C. Niemella, B. Eastman, Avifauna Along Parts of the Los Angeles River by Peter Bloom, April 2002. Website: www.folar.org/avifauna.html.

Goldberg, S. K., B.J. Adams, C. Denardo, S.A. Williams, M.J. Wyss, M.C. Robinson, S.L. Martin, M.S. Shackley, T.M. Oringer, J.L. McVicar, and Beta Analytic Inc. 1999. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Headquarters Facility Project the People of Yaanga?: Archaeological Investigations at CA-LAN-1575/H. Submitted to Union Station Partners, on behalf of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research. October 11, 2002. Website: <http://www.ceqanet.ca.gov>.

Great Schools.net. February 2003. Website: <http://www.greatschools.net>.

Greenwood, Roberta S. 1996. Down at the Station. Monumenta Archaeologica No. 18. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

HDR, Inc. 2003. Draft Alternatives Report – Supplemental Alternatives Considered.

HDR, Inc. 2003. Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Track Project – Bridge Type Selection Report.

Hesson, B.H. 1993. Oat Mountain and Union Station Oil Fields, California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, Publication TR42.

Horne, Melinda C., M. Colleen Hamilton, and Susan K. Goldberg. 2000. Alameda Corridor Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties Discovered During Project Implementation, Second Draft, Addendum to Finding of Effect. Prepared for Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority; prepared by Applied EarthWorks, Inc., Hemet, California.

Huey, Gene, and John Romani. 1980. Site form for CA-LAN-7/H. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

Interstate Commerce Commission, Valuation Division (ICC). 1916. Right of Way and Track Map, The Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. Co., Los Angeles Division, Redondo District, California, Station 103+93.3 to Station 156+72.4. Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of

Jones & Stokes. October 2000. URBEMIS7G for Windows, Computer Program User's Guide, Version 5.1.0, Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects.

Lamar, Donald L. 1970. Geology of the Elysian Park-Repetto Hills Area, Los Angeles County, California Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 101, 40 pages, map and figures.

Los Angeles Almanac. May 6, 2003. Federal Correctional Facilities in Los Angeles County. Website: <http://www.losangelesalmanac.com>.

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. 2003. website:

Los Angeles Fire Department. January 2003. Website: <http://www.lafd.org/>.

Los Angeles Housing Authority. April 2003. Website: <http://www.hacla.org>.

Los Angeles Police Department. 2001. Los Angeles Police Department Statistical Digest.

Los Angeles Police Department. January 2003. Website: <http://www.lapd.org/>.

Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. January 2003. Website: <http://www.lasd.org>.

Los Angeles Times. April 7, 2002. "Helping People off the Streets: Sheriff Baca's Bold Vision." Editorial.

Los Angeles Times. May 22, 2003.

Los Angeles Unified School District. March and April 2003. Website: <http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us>.

Mandell, Jason. April 11, 2003. "Historic Core Leader Resigns: Downtown Center BID Takes Over Services." The Los Angeles Downtown News.

Mandell, Jason. May 12, 2003. "The Big Boom: Downtown Development Surges With Over 80 Projects." The Los Angeles Downtown News.

Mandell, Jason. March 31, 2003. "Parker Center Plan Picks Up Steam: Downtown Firms to Design Police Headquarters in Little Tokyo." The Los Angeles Downtown News.

Mandell, Jason. February 17, 2003. "Downtown Hits the Big Time." The Los Angeles Downtown News.

Mandell, Jason. September 30, 2002. "The Loft Pioneers." The Los Angeles Downtown News.

Maryknoll Japanese Catholic Center. History of Maryknoll Japanese Catholic Center. Website: http://www.japanesecatholiccenter.com/history_info.html. March 19, 2003.

McCarthy Building Companies, Inc. December 30, 2002. McCarthy-Clark-Hunt Joint Venture Signs Contract Agreement for Replacement Hospital in Los Angeles. Website: <http://www.mccarthy.com/news/content/news-content.html>. Accessed March 19, 2003.

McGreevy, Patrick. March 22, 2003. "City Panel Advises Buying a Building to Serve as Temporary LAPD Headquarters." The Los Angeles Times.

Metrolink - www.metrolinktrains.com.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. August 1995. Headquarters Facility Project Draft Environmental Impact Report, Volume I, Report No. 1099.

National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research (NCEER) Workshop Participants, Summary Report, 1997. Proceedings of the NCEER Workshop on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils, Technical Report NCEER-97-0022, December 1997.

National Transportation Safety Board. July 1998. "We Are All Safer: NTSB-Inspired Improvements in Transportation Safety."

National Trust for Historic Preservation. National Trust Makes Largest Loan in its History. Website: <http://www.nationaltrust.org/>. July 8, 2002.

Office of Historic Preservation. 1992. California Points of Historical Interest. Sacramento, California.

Office of Historic Preservation. _____. Historic Properties Directory. Sacramento, California

Office of Mayor Jim Hahn. March 7, 2002. Construction Contracts To Be Awarded FY 02-03 Through FY 03-04. Website: <http://www.ci.la.ca.us/mayor/InfrastructureProjects.pdf>.

Owens, Shelley M. 1997. Site form for 19-002610. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

The Pankow Companies. Office Buildings. Website: http://www.pankow.com/markets_served_frame.html. April 30, 2003.

Psomas. 2002. Utility locations (electronic files).

South Central Coastal Information Center. 1998. Archaeological Investigations at Maintenance of Way Facility, South Santa Fe Avenue (CA-LAN-2563H). On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

South Central Coastal Information Center. 1999. Site form for Site19-002791. On file: South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Fullerton.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). November 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

SCAQMD 2003a. February 2003. Highest (Most Conservative) EMFAC 2002 (version 2.2) Emission Factors for On-Road Vehicles. Provided to Chandra Hodge of HDR Engineering via facsimile from Gordon Mize of SCAQMD on February 21, 2003.

SCAQMD 2003b. March 2003. Rules and Regulations (updated quarterly on the SCAQMD web site at www.aqmd.gov/rules/rulesreg.html).

Southern California Association of Governments. 2002. Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). April 2001. 2001 Regional Transportation Plan.

_____. 1999. State of the Commute.

_____. 2003. Draft Projections.

Southern California Gas Company. 2001. Gas Report:

Southern California Rapid Transit District. Metro Rail Project, Los Angeles Central Business District to North Hollywood. Construction Contract No. A130. Record Drawings. Approved 1/6/88. Redline As-builts.

Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA). May 2003. Information on fuel consumption provided via phone call from Joanna Capelle, SCRRA to Louis Utsimi of Myra Frank & Associates, and documented via e-mail from Louis Utsimi to Edward Liebsch of HDR Engineering on May 30, 2003.

_____. June 2003, Projected Metrolink Trains, LAUS 2025.

_____. June 24, 2002. Operating Assumptions for Weekday Service.

Starzak, R. 1994. Historic Property Survey Report for the Proposed Alameda Corridor from the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to Downtown Los Angeles, in Los Angeles County, California. Submitted to Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation: District 7. Submitted by Myra L. Frank & Associates, Los Angeles, CA.

Suchey, Judith. 1993. Analysis of Human Skeletal Remains Uncovered at Metro Rail Project A-135. In Cultural Resources Impact Mitigation Program, Los Angeles Metro Red Line Segment One (Chinatown), by R. S. Greenwood, pp. 319–322. Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, California. Prepared for Metropolitan Transportation Agency, Los Angeles.

Swope, K. K. 1997. Historical Study Report for the Alameda Corridor Project North End Improvements, Los Angeles County, California. Submitted to Myra L. Frank & Associates, Los Angeles, CA, and Applied EarthWorks, Inc., Hemet, CA.

Thomas Bros. Maps. 2002. The Thomas Guide 2003: Los Angeles and Orange County.

Tibold Construction Company. June 2002. Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Teramachi Seniors Housing Project. Prepared by Envicom Corporation.

Trevino, Joseph. January 21-27, 2000. “Home Sweet Dump: Some 1,400 Low-Income Tenants Live Atop an Old Refinery and Toxic Dump.” LA Weekly.

U.S. Department of Transportation. 2002. FRA Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. [in chapter 3-12]

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). June 2003. AirData: Access to Air Pollution Data. www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html.

USEPA. October 2002. Compilation of Emission Factors, Publication AP-42, Section 13.2.1, Paved Roads.

USEPA. September 1998. Compilation of Emission Factors, Publication AP-42, Section 13.2.2, Unpaved Roads.

USEPA. June 1998. Median Life, Annual Activity, and Load Factor Values for Nonroad Engine Emissions Modeling, Report No. NR-005A. Office of Mobile Sources (now renamed Office of Transportation and Air Quality).

USEPA. January 1995. Compilation of Emission Factors, Publication AP-42, Section 11.19.2, Concrete & Pavement Demolition.

United States Census Bureau. 2003. 2000 Census, various tables. <http://www.census.gov>.

United States Federal Transit Administration. 1995. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. FTA Report DOT-T-95-16.

United States Federal Transit Administration. 1995. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. FTA Report DOT-T-95-16.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. USFWS Pacific Region, Migratory Birds and Habitats Programs. migratorybirds.pacific.fws.gov/mbta.htm.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. USFWS Pacific Region, Migratory Birds and Habitats Programs. migratorybirds.pacific.fws.gov/mbta.htm.

United States Geological Survey. 1981. 7.5 Minute Topographic Quadrangle, Los Angeles, California. Photo revised 1992.

Western Regional Climate Center. July 2003. Los Angeles Basin Area, California Climate Summaries. www.wrcc.dri.edu/summary/climsmla.html.

Youd, T.L. and Perkins, D M. 1978. "Mapping liquefaction-induced ground failure potential," Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, v. 104, no. GT4, p. 433-446.

Zenshuji Soto Mission. Website: <http://www.zenshuji.org/>. March 19, 2003.