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1 Introduction

This Findings of Fact (Findings) and the Statement of Overriding Considerations summarize the findings of environmental impacts of the Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (City of Los Angeles 2016, SCH No. 2013011001) and presents the Statement of Overriding Considerations. This section presents an overview of the purpose of this document, summarizes the proposed Project (which is identified as the Locally Preferred Alternative [LPA]), and presents the organization of this document.

1.1 Purpose of Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations

Section 15091 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (and Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code) require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more written findings for each such impact. According to Section 21081, “no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant impacts on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

(a) The public agency makes one or more of the following possible findings with respect to each significant effect:
   1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to mitigate or avoid the significant impacts on the environment.
   2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
   3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(b) With respect to significant impacts which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant impacts on the environment.”

Section 21081.6 of CEQA also requires public agencies to adopt a monitoring and reporting program for assessing and ensuring the implementation of proposed mitigation measures. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles, which is provided under separate cover, are those identified within this Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations is a written statement explaining the specific reasons why the social, economic, legal, technical or other beneficial aspects of the proposed Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts and why the Lead Agency is willing to
accept such impacts. This statement shall be based on the final EIR and/or other substantial evidence in the record.

1.2 Overview of the Proposed Project

The proposed Project is described in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR and, in Section 1.6 of the Final EIR, an LPA has been recommended that consists of the construction and operation of streetcar service in downtown Los Angeles, California, up to a 3.8-mile one-way loop. The project alignment would begin at Hill and 1st Streets, run east along 1st Street, south along Broadway, west along 11th Street, north along Figueroa Street, east along 7th Street and north along Hill Street, back to its beginning at 1st Street. Potential inclusion of a Grand Avenue Extension would also provide a two-way alignment spur west along 1st Street, beginning at Hill Street, and continuing south along Grand Avenue to a stop north of 2nd Street. The LPA also includes a Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) site; two are now recommended for implementation—Broadway/2nd Street and 11th Street/Olive Street (East). The number and placement of station platforms and traction power substations (TPSS) will be determined in final design of the LPA.

The project route would cover an area composed primarily of commercial land uses with a mix of residential, public, and entertainment land uses. The Project would link several neighborhoods or districts within the Central City Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles: Civic Center, Bunker Hill, Historic Core, Jewelry District, Financial Core, South Park, Fashion District, and LA Live/Convention Center. This dense urban area is the region’s largest employment center and one of the region’s largest tourist destinations. Also, the downtown Los Angeles resident population has grown to over 52,000 residents with 6,880 new residents between 2011 and 2013, and 23,520 new residents from 2006 to 2013. Streetcar stops would be located approximately every block in the north/south direction and approximately every other block in the east/west direction.

The proposed configuration of track and roadway lanes would permit a mixed flow of vehicles and a fleet of electrically powered streetcars. The proposed streetcar service would operate 7 days a week with an estimated three to six streetcars running at any given time. At an estimated average operating speed of 6 miles per hour (mph) during peak periods, the run time for a round trip would be approximately 35 to 40 minutes. At morning and evening peak hours, an estimated six vehicles would be in operation, with headways of approximately 7 minutes at a given location. Power to the streetcar vehicles would be provided by approximately five TPSSs and an overhead contact system (OCS). An MSF site would also be constructed as part of the Project.

The objectives of the Project are as follows:

- **Land Use and Economic Development:** Support the growth and revitalization of downtown Los Angeles, including its historic districts, through the following:
  - Revitalize geographically isolated, underutilized areas.
  - Promote smart, sustainable growth that helps to reduce sprawl.
  - Implement transit policies that support the City's General Plan.
  - Integrate transit and land use within the study area.
  - Encourage historic restoration and transit-oriented development.
  - Strengthen downtown's economic competitiveness.
Foster a more livable downtown.
Create a distinctive tourist draw that would expand the economic base of the City and maximize tax revenue.
Improve transit access to existing and planned developments.
Improve interconnectivity between residential areas, employment and activity centers, and retail services.
Help to create a vibrant outdoor ambience that would attract residents and visitors to the streets of downtown Los Angeles.

**Mobility:** Enhance mobility and transit circulation in downtown Los Angeles through the following:
Connect major districts, destinations, and activity centers.
Improve transit coverage and circulation.
Provide easy to use, localized, high-frequency service.
Serve transit-dependent populations.
Improve transit accessibility and operational efficiency.

**Congestion Relief:** Create pedestrian-oriented amenities interconnected with sidewalks and public space that will enhance downtown Los Angeles’ distinct identity through the following:
Reduce dependency on automobiles by implementing transit services and improving walkability.
Increase mobility and accessibility for visitors and people who live and work in downtown.

**Environmental Benefits:** Protect and improve aspects of the downtown core through the following:
Preserve the area’s historic significance and revitalize the Historic Core.
Reduce automobile trips within downtown.

### 1.3 Document Organization

This Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are organized in the following way:

- **Section 1, Introduction,** provides background information of the purpose of Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations and presents the organization of this document and provides a brief overview of the proposed Project.
- **Section 2, Statement of Environmental Impacts and Required Findings,** identifies the issue areas for which the proposed Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact, and presents a summary of the significant impacts of the proposed Project along with the one or more written findings made by the public agency explaining how it dealt with each of the significant impacts and mitigation measures.
• Section 3, Alternatives Considered, describes the alternatives evaluated in the EIR, and the findings and rationale for selection of the proposed Project and rejection of the alternatives, including the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

• Section 4, Statement of Overriding Considerations, explains in detail why the social, economic, legal, technical or other beneficial aspects of the proposed Project outweighs the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts and why the agency is willing to accept such impacts.

2 Statement of Environmental Impacts and Required Findings

This section discusses the impacts and mitigation measures identified for the proposed Project, and makes findings for all areas of potential impact.

The EIR focused on those potential impacts of the proposed Project on the environment that the Lead Agency has determined may be significant. Chapter 5 of the EIR determined that the proposed Project would have either no impact or less-than-significant impacts regarding the following issue areas:

• Agriculture and Forestry Resources
• Biological Resources
• Hydrology and Water Quality
• Mineral Resources
• Population and Housing
• Public Services and Recreation
• Utilities and Service Systems

As described in Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and detailed in the EIR, these issues have no potential for significant impacts and required no further environmental review or analysis beyond the discussion in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR.

The following issue areas analyzed in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR were determined to result in less-than-significant impacts or less-than-significant impacts with mitigation:

• Aesthetics
• Air Quality
• Cultural Resources
• Energy
• Geology
• Greenhouse Gas Emissions
• Hazards and Hazardous Materials
• Land Use
Transportation and Traffic (Construction impacts only)

Potentially significant impacts (from construction and/or operation) occurring as a result of implementation of the proposed Project that require mitigation measures would be in the following resource areas:

- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic

The issue areas determined in the Draft EIR to have unavoidable significant impacts from the construction of the proposed Project, even after mitigation, include:

- Noise: Construction noise levels would exceed specified limits in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*. Impacts would, however, be temporary and transitory, with impacts moving away from affected locations to the next area of construction. Noise associated with construction of the MSF would be experienced by receptors in the vicinity for longer periods of time. Mitigation measures would reduce overall construction noise impacts, but residual noise impacts could remain.

- Transportation and Traffic: Traffic operations at three intersections would have delays exceeding City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) impacts significance criteria:
  - Hill Street/1st Street
  - Hill Street/7th Street
  - Grand Avenue/1st Street (under the Grand Avenue Extension)

- Transportation and Traffic: Bicycle/rail flangeway conflicts would exist on street segments without designated bicycle lanes and where bicycles and streetcars must share the curb travel lane. This occurs at the following locations:
  - Broadway – 1st to 11th Streets
  - Hill Street –7th Street to 1st Street

Conflicts consist of the potential for bicycle tires to become lodged in streetcar track flangeways.

Each of the resource areas analyzed in the EIR is discussed in terms of:

- *Description of Potential Impacts* are specific descriptions of the environmental impacts identified in the EIR as significant or potentially significant.

- *Mitigation Measures* are the proposed mitigation measures for the impacts identified as significant or potentially significant.

- *Findings* are the findings made in accordance with Section 21081 of *CEQA*. One of the three possible findings is made for each significant or potentially significant impact, in response to Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The significance of the environmental impacts after mitigation is also provided.

- *Rationale* is a summary of the reasons for the findings.

- *References* are notations on the specific section in the EIR or other information source that support the findings.
2.1 Aesthetics

2.1.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Aesthetics were evaluated for potential impacts across a range of factors, including (1) removal, alteration or demolition of existing visual features; (2) natural open space areas; (3) visual contrast with existing features; (4) zone changes; (5) contribution to the area's aesthetic value; (6) applicable guidelines and regulations; (7) nature and quality of recognized or valued views; (8) views from scenic highways, corridors, or parkways; (8) view obstruction; (9) impacts on views from transportation corridors; (10) changes in ambient illumination during nighttime; (11) lighting spill affecting adjacent sensitive areas; and (12) shading at sensitive areas. Either no impact or a less-than-significant impact was found for all impacts, including those to be experienced during the Project's construction period and while it is in operation.

2.1.2 Mitigation Measures

**MM-AES-C1: Construction Staging/Stockpiled Materials and Equipment.** Under the direction of the LABOE, the construction contractor shall be the responsible party for providing temporary construction fencing along the periphery of active construction areas to screen as much of the construction activity as possible from view at the street level.

To minimize views of stockpiled materials and idled construction equipment in staging areas and to reduce visual clutter and disorder, consistent with Bureau of Engineering Master Specification Environmental Control Measures, project construction staging areas shall be enclosed or screened from view at the street level with appropriate screening materials. The contractor shall provide daily visual inspections to ensure that the immediate surroundings of construction staging areas are free from construction-related clutter and graffiti and maintain the areas in a clean and orderly manner throughout the construction period. Graffiti shall be promptly painted over, masked out, or cleaned off. Routine sidewalk and window washing to remove dust generated by construction shall be scheduled weekly. LABOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contract Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-AES-C2: Nighttime Construction Activities.** Should construction activities with associated lighting occur during nighttime, the City shall ensure that lighting will be directed away from surrounding sensitive land uses and toward the specific location intended for illumination. Lighting associated with construction activities and security purposes shall be shielded to minimize the production of glare and spill light around sensitive land uses in the surrounding area. LABOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-AES-C3: Tree Removal/Relocation.** Should mature trees, as well as younger trees (with trunk diameters of 5 inches or less) be trimmed or removed, the proposed Project would comply with the City of Los Angeles Tree Preservation Ordinance and Tree Preservation Policy. City policy requires all tree removals be replaced on a 2:1 basis for street trees and 4:1 basis for protected private property trees. No protected trees were identified throughout the proposed alignment and at the potential

---

1 City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering
MSF siting locations. Replacement trees would be placed as near their original locations as possible. Alternative methods and options to removal, such as trimming, would be explored prior to considering potential tree removal. The Project’s compliance with the City of Los Angeles Tree Preservation Ordinance and Tree Preservation Policy would ensure that any street trees slated for removal would be planted at or near their original locations at 2:1 ratios. Removal or relocation of protected trees, under the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, requires a permit from the Board of Public Works. A protected tree report must be submitted to the Board of Public Works to apply for a tree removal permit. Before a Special Habitat Value tree, as defined by the City’s Tree Preservation Policy, is pruned, damaged, relocated, or removed, recommendations from the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services, Urban Forestry Division must be obtained. The Urban Forestry Division makes a recommendation to the Board of Public Works for removal. The Board of Public Works must make the final approval before the trees(s) can be removed.

**MM-AES-O1: Design of Traction Power Substation Structures.** The City of Los Angeles shall ensure that all TPSS structures would be designed to minimize their visual presence. Where site and design allow, the TPSS structures shall incorporate design and location features, such as the minimization of the size of the structures, setbacks from adjoining street frontages, screening, and/or architectural treatments that are appropriate to the design setting where visible from the public right-of-way at street level. All TPSS structures shall be designed and built to satisfy the established final design requirements and in compliance with all applicable design guidelines, policies, and development standards, including required Public Benefit performance measures, if necessary. Should a TPSS be located within the public right-of-way, it shall be designed in conformance with the Los Angeles Above-Ground Facility regulations contained in Section 62.08 of the LAMC. LABOE shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-AES-O2: Maintenance Storage Facility Design and Operational Lighting.** The City of Los Angeles shall ensure that the MSF site plan, building treatments and architecture would be appropriate in scale, proportion, and detail with appropriate use of material, texture, articulation, and color in consideration of the surrounding design context. The aesthetic treatment shall be designed and built in compliance with all applicable design guidelines, policies, and development standards. Light associated with the MSF shall be properly controlled and directed on site in a manner that would minimize the potential for spill light. The Project would adhere to the requirements of LAMC Section 14.00 in all respects and will follow all applicable procedures. All applicable performance standards or alternative compliance measures will be addressed and all procedures for review and approval will be followed. LABOE shall ensure the carrying out of the mitigation measure.

**MM-AES-O3: Overhead Contact System Poles.** The City of Los Angeles shall ensure that design and installation of the OCS poles will be consistent with the surrounding design context. OCS poles shall be designed and installed in compliance with all applicable design guidelines, policies, and development standards. LABOE shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

### 2.1.3 Findings

For the above impacts to aesthetics, the following finding is made:
Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts to aesthetics from the operation of the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

- Significant
- Not Significant

### 2.1.4 Rationale

Impacts to be experienced while the Project is under construction may remove some features that may be considered valued by the neighborhood or community, including street trees. Construction would also result in temporary disturbance due to the presence of construction equipment, staging areas, exposed excavation areas, and other general construction activities. Construction would also involve the use of nighttime lighting where construction activities are occurring. Some views normally available would be obstructed while construction is occurring. While these impacts are recognized as being disturbances to the typical visual environment, they are common and typical of construction activities in urban areas, they would be temporary, and all applicable regulations for controlling such activities would be followed. In addition, specific mitigation measures are proposed to lessen the impacts during construction. For these reasons, the impacts are considered less than significant.

Streetcar operations would introduce permanent built elements, including station platforms with canopies, catenary poles, OCS wires, and TPSS units. Streetcar vehicles would operate on an established frequency over a substantial number of hours during the day and evening. Also, either of the MSF sites would contain a two- to three-story maintenance building, outside tracks, and employee parking area, with streetcar vehicles entering and exiting the MSF as well as being stored overnight. Restoration of streetcar service within downtown Los Angeles would be consistent with its historic presence for many years, including all of the same physical elements that are currently proposed. Existing visual features within downtown that are considered valued would not be obstructed. Historic sidewalk areas have been identified and would be protected. All applicable regulations regarding visual and aesthetic treatment would be followed and specific mitigation measures are proposed. For these reasons, the impacts are considered less than significant.

### 2.1.5 References

Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project’s aesthetic impacts.
2.2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

2.2.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Regional Emissions. Construction would not result in regional impact criteria pollutant emissions that would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds.

Local Emissions. Construction would result in local impact criteria pollutant emissions (nitrogen oxide [NO\textsubscript{X}], particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter [PM\textsubscript{10}], and particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter [PM\textsubscript{2.5}]) that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. With the implementation of MM-AQ-C1: Use cleaner-burning off-road construction equipment, impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). Construction would not expose receptors to significant levels of TACs.

Odors. Construction odors could be created from construction equipment diesel exhaust and application of architectural coatings. Such odors, if noticeable at nearby sensitive receptors, would be temporary and transitory.

Streetcar operations, including operation of the MSF, would not result in local criteria pollutant impacts exceeding SCAQMD thresholds or meaningful changes in emissions of air toxics. Streetcar operations would also not result in odors.

Regional Emissions. The Project would not result in regional criteria pollutant emissions (lead, reactive organic gas, NO\textsubscript{X}, carbon monoxide [CO], sulfur oxides, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. A small reduction may be expected from reduced auto use downtown.

Local Emissions. The Project would not result in local impact criteria pollutant emissions (NO\textsubscript{X}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. A small reduction may be expected from reduced auto use downtown. The Project would not be considered a Project of Air Quality Concern, nor would it result in a concern related to mobile air toxics.

California CO standards. Operation of the Project would not result in an exceedance of or exacerbate an existing exceedance of an ambient air quality standard.

TAC/Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT). The Project would not result in meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause an increase in MSAT impacts of the Project.

On-site Stationary Sources. The Project would not result in on-site stationary source emissions of TACs.

On-site Hazardous Materials. On-site storage and use of potentially hazardous materials would follow applicable regulations and requirements. The Project and MSF operation would not expose receptors to significant levels of TACs.

Occupancy of Sensitive Individuals. The Project would not involve the use of hazardous materials on its vehicles, nor would times of exposure for passengers waiting at stations result in any hazard.

Odor. The Project and MSF operation would not create objectionable odors at nearby sensitive receptors.
2.2.2 Mitigation Measures

**MM-AQ-C1: Use cleaner-burning off-road construction equipment per the following schedule:**
The contractor shall ensure that all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with best available control technology (BACT) devices certified by ARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by ARB regulations. The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the Department of Public Works Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

2.2.3 Findings

For the above impacts on air quality, the following finding is made:

- ☑ Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

- ☐ Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency

- ☐ Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions from the operation of the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

- ☐ Significant
- ☑ Not Significant

2.2.4 Rationale

Construction impacts would be temporary, they would be controlled with adherence to all applicable regulations, and specific mitigation measures are proposed that would substantially lessen the impacts. For these reasons, these impacts are considered less than significant. Streetcar operations would not result in exceedances of established significance thresholds. Operational impacts are also considered less than significant.

2.2.5 References

Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project’s air quality impacts.
2.3 Cultural Resources

2.3.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Archaeological resources were not discovered within the project area and are not expected to be encountered during construction. Historic properties would not be affected during construction, with the potential exception of historic sidewalk features, including sidewalk terrazzo installations, vault lights, and basement vault hatch doors. Paleontological resources are not likely to be encountered during construction.

Streetcar elements (e.g., catenary poles, OCS wires, station platforms) would be designed and installed so as to be consistent with the period of significance for the historic streetcar and for many of the historic properties in the project area.

2.3.2 Mitigation Measures

**MM-CUL-C1:** As part of final design, a detailed field survey shall be conducted to identify historic sidewalk features that need to be avoided, protected during construction, or altered in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards. Conditions to protect the historic sidewalk features and preserve the material in place during construction will be required. Historic sidewalk features should be covered with a protective material to avoid scratches and staining from adjacent construction work. OCS poles will not be installed in terrazzo installations or vault lights. Sidewalk ramps will be designed or located to avoid physical damage or alteration of historic sidewalk features. The existing concrete curb will not be removed at bump out areas in order to protect the historic sidewalk feature from being saw cut or from cracking. These measures will reduce the potential to alter or cause physical damage to the historic sidewalk features, and therefore ensure no substantial adverse change to the historic district or individually significant resources. Should incidental damage occur during construction occur, the historic sidewalk feature will be repaired or replaced in kind by a qualified contractor in a manner consistent with the Secretary’s Standards. In the unlikely event that the sidewalk feature cannot be treated in accordance with the Secretary’s Standards, there would still be a less-than-significant impact on the historic building that fronts the sidewalk, and there would be no substantial adverse change in the overall significance of the historical resource because enough contributing features would remain that the historical resource would retain its designation.

**MM-CUL-C2:** If discovery is made of items of paleontological interest, the Contractor shall immediately cease excavation in the area of discovery and shall not continue until ordered by the Engineer. When resumed, excavation operations within the area of discovery shall be as directed by the Engineer. Discoveries which may be encountered may include, but not be limited to, dwelling sites, stone implements or other artifacts, animal bones, human bones, and fossils.

**MM-CUL-O1:** The City of Los Angeles shall ensure that design and installation of all project facilities and elements that are adjacent to or abutting historical resources or within a historic district will be consistent with the surrounding design context. The appropriateness of the design will be achieved through consultation with and approval by the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources, applying the Secretary’s Standards. Project facilities and elements shall be designed for consistency and installed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and will be in compliance with the *Historic Downtown Los Angeles Design Guidelines* and the *Broadway Streetscape Master Plan*, as applicable. LABOE shall be the responsible party. LABOE shall consult on the design with the City of Los Angeles.
Office of Historic Resources. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

2.3.3 Findings

For the above impacts to cultural resources, the following finding is made:

☑ Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

☐ Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

☐ Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts to cultural resources from the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

☐ Significant ☒ Not Significant

2.3.4 Rationale

Neither archaeological nor paleontological resources are expected to be encountered during construction of the Project. Some historic features could be affected during construction, but specific mitigation measures are proposed—conditions requiring protection of historic sidewalk features and preserving the material in place during construction; OCS poles will not be installed in terrazzo installations or vault lights; sidewalk ramps will be designed or located to avoid physical damage or alteration of historic sidewalk features; and the existing concrete curb will not be removed at bump out areas, in order to protect the historic sidewalk feature from being saw cut or from cracking—to substantially lessen the impacts. Streetcar installations and operation are expected to be consistent with the historic environment in which it will operate. For these reasons, these impacts are considered less than significant.

2.3.5 References

Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project’s cultural resources impacts.

2.4 Energy

No significant or potentially significant impacts related to energy were identified in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR.
2.5 Geology and Soils

2.5.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Neither construction nor operation would exacerbate existing seismic hazards or create new ones. The northern portion of the alignment, including the Grand Avenue Extension, would be susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading. No impacts are expected with regard to landslides, expansive soils, or landform alteration. During construction, some erosion and temporary reduction in soil stability could occur.

2.5.2 Mitigation Measures

RCM-GEO-C1: In order to ensure that utility relocation, track-laying activities, and MSF construction do not result in a substantially increased risk of soil instability, temporary shoring shall be used for lateral support, and properly compacted fill soils or cement slurry shall be used for excavation backfill. A geotechnical report shall be prepared during the design phase, subject to approval by the City, that will address the following topics, and will also recommend specific design specifications, which may include, but are not limited to:

- **Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading:** Methods for construction in areas with a potential liquefaction hazard may include in situ ground modification, removal of liquefiable layers and replacement with compacted fill, or support of project improvements on piles at depths designed specifically for liquefaction. Pile foundations can be designed for a liquefaction hazard by supporting the piles on dense soil or bedrock located below the liquefiable zone or employing other appropriate methods, as evaluated during the site-specific evaluation. Additional recommendations for mitigation pertaining to liquefaction may include densification by installation of stone columns, vibration, deep dynamic compaction, and/or compaction grouting.

- **Structural Support:** Recommendations will be made related to the methods of construction of the MSF in proximity to existing buildings, such as buffer distances to maintain from existing buildings or structural supports for these buildings during the construction period.

The construction contractor shall implement all recommendations from this report into the work plan. The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the Department of Public Works Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

Requirements under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process shall be followed, including preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that incorporates Best Management Practices (BMP).

2.5.3 Findings

For the above impacts on geology and soils, the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts to geology and soils from the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

- Significant [x] Not Significant

### 2.5.4 Rationale

Construction impacts would be temporary and they would be controlled with adherence to all applicable regulatory control measures that would substantially lessen the impacts, including RCM-GEO-C1. For these reasons, these impacts are considered less than significant. Operational impacts would not require mitigation measures and are also considered less than significant.

### 2.5.5 References

Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's geologic impacts.

### 2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

No significant or potentially significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions were identified in Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR.

### 2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

#### 2.7.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Construction could result in excavation and disposal of hazardous materials, potential for contaminated groundwater, and release of hazardous materials. During construction, the transport of contaminated soils could involve potential risks to construction workers and the general public along roadways. Project operation would entail the routine handling of hazardous materials for daily functions within the MSF.

#### 2.7.2 Mitigation Measures

**MM-HM-C1:** During construction, a focused PSI shall be conducted at specified locations adjacent to the identified sites of concern with moderate, high, and indeterminate risks as well as the proposed locations for the MSF and TPSSs. A PSI in these areas shall include a soil boring and laboratory analytical program to address contaminants of concern specific to each site. Soils that have visible staining or an odor shall first be tested in the field by the contractor or qualified environmental subcontractor with an organic vapor analyzer (OVA) or other field equipment for volatile
components, which require additional considerations in their handling. Soil with OVA readings exceeding 50 ppm for VOCs (probe held 3 inches from the excavated soil face), or that is visibly stained or has a detectable petrochemical odor, shall be stockpiled by the contractor separately from non-contaminated soils. The stockpiles shall be barricaded near the excavation area, away from drainage areas or catch basins, on an impermeable plastic liner (6-millimeter nominal thickness and tested at 100 pounds per square inch). Caution must be taken to separate any contaminated soil from the remainder of the excavated material. If only a small amount of contaminated soil is encountered, it may be drummed in 55-gallon steel drums with sealing lids. The DPW Bureau of Engineering (BOE), through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-HM-C2:** Soil shall be sampled in a random and representative manner. To establish waste classification, samples shall be analyzed for total recoverable petroleum hydrocarbons (TRPH), VOCs, and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) as gasoline or diesel if these fuels are found in the area, Title 22 heavy metals, reactivity (pH), corrosivity, and toxicity. The number of samples shall depend on the volume of material removed, with one sample for approximately every ton of soil. Storage space available at the site and neighborhood sensitivity shall determine the amount of soil that can be stockpiled. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-HM-C3:** If VOCs are present at concentrations exceeding 50 ppm, a permit from the South Coast Air Quality Management District shall be required, which most likely shall require control of vapor, such as covering the stockpiles with plastic sheeting or wetting with water or a soap solution. The contractor shall obtain all necessary permits. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-HM-C4:** During construction, suspected contaminated soil samples shall be taken to a state-certified environmental laboratory or tested in the field with a mobile lab and technician using infrared spectrometry in accordance with appropriate testing methods. Materials with elevated levels of TRPH, metals, or other regulated contaminants shall require handling by workers who have been adequately trained for health and safety aspects of hazardous material handling. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-HM-C5:** Any contaminated material (soil, asphalt, railroad ballast, concrete, or debris) that is to be hauled off-site and is considered a “waste product” shall be classified as hazardous or nonhazardous waste under all criteria by both state and federal codes prior to disposal. If the waste soil or other material is determined hazardous, a hazardous waste manifest shall be prepared by the contractor or its qualified representative and the material transported to an appropriate class of facility for recycling or landfill disposal by a registered hazardous material transporter. If the soil is nonhazardous but still exceeds levels that preclude its return to the excavation, a less-costly nonhazardous transporter and soil recycling facility shall be used if no hazardous constituents are present above their respective action levels. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.
MM-HM-C6: At the start of construction, all construction contractors shall be instructed to immediately stop all subsurface activities in the event that potentially hazardous materials are encountered, an odor is identified, or significantly stained soil is visible. Contractors shall be instructed to follow all applicable regulations regarding discovery and response for hazardous materials encountered during the construction process. Furthermore, hazardous waste generated by the contractor at the site shall be disposed of in accordance with the City’s Notification of Hazardous Substances General Conditions in the construction contract. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-HM-C7: In the event groundwater is encountered during construction, dewatering shall be minimized to that required for removing interior or nuisance water from structures. Sampling ports shall be provided in the dewatering system. The produced water shall be required to be temporarily stored in large Baker-type tanks and analyzed by a state-certified environmental laboratory selected by the contractor. If the groundwater quality falls within guidelines established by the DPW, Bureau of Sanitation, a permit shall be obtained to discharge the water into a nearby sewer. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-HM-C8: During construction, if hydrocarbon or other water contamination precludes the measures in MM-HM-C7, the contaminated groundwater shall be treated on site (such as in an oil-water separator) or hauled off site for treatment and disposal in accordance with applicable regulations by a licensed professional. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

2.7.3 Findings

For the above impacts on hazards and hazardous materials, the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts on hazards and hazardous materials from the operation of the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

- Significant
- Not Significant
2.7.4 Rationale

Public works construction projects often involve encountering potentially hazardous materials, including contaminated soils and groundwater. Standard regulatory provisions are in place to deal with such situations. Similarly, industrial operations, such as the maintenance activities at the MSF, have similar regulatory controls that must be followed. Adherence to such regulatory measures is adequate for daily construction and operational activities. In addition, a number of mitigation measures have been specified to ensure adequate control of and protection from potential accidental release or explosion of a hazardous substance. Sensitive uses (e.g., schools) would be taken into account when selecting haul routes. For these reasons, these impacts are considered less than significant.

2.7.5 References

Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project’s hazardous waste and materials impacts.

2.8 Land Use and Planning

2.8.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Construction activities would occur within city streets or on the MSF site; such activities would present a temporary disruption. Construction would also displace land uses on the MSF site, which include the Guadalupe Wedding Chapel, one vacant business, and the existing parking lot business. All elements of the Project would become new features of the downtown land use setting, including streetcar tracks, catenary poles and OCS wires, TPSS units, and the MSF.

2.8.2 Mitigation Measures

RCM-LU-C1: Business Access and Signage. The construction contractor shall provide signs for businesses whose frontage is obstructed by construction work indicating that the business is open during construction, and provide information regarding access to the business.

RCM-LU-C2: Business Displacement. Proposed displacement of the Guadalupe Wedding Chapel and any other businesses subject to displacement as a result of the Project would occur in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, including the Uniform Business Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as mentioned. If MSF Site 4, the west side of Broadway between 2nd and 3rd Streets were to be chosen, the business would also be displaced. Compensation to the property owner and business operator(s), and relocation assistance would be provided.

RCM-LU-O1: Downtown Design Guidelines. Design of the Project would comply with all applicable guidelines and requirements included in the Downtown Design Guidelines and Public Benefit projects performance measures, if necessary.

MM-LU-O1: LAMC Public Benefits Projects Conformity. The Project shall adhere to the requirements of LAMC Section 14.00 in all respects and shall follow all applicable procedures. All applicable performance standards or alternative compliance measures shall be addressed and all
procedures for review and approval shall be followed. The City of Los Angeles BOE shall ensure the carrying out of the mitigation measure.

2.8.3 Findings

For the above impacts on land use and planning, the following finding is made:

☑ Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

☐ Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

☐ Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts on land use and planning from the operation of the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

☐ Significant ☒ Not Significant

2.8.4 Rationale

The potential for construction activities to adversely affect ongoing activities at adjacent land uses would be controlled through the active management of the construction process, maintaining access to businesses and residences, and providing signage. All permanent features of the Project would be designed, sized, and aesthetically treated to be in compliance with all applicable regulations and plans. Appropriate City of Los Angeles agencies and authorities would review and approve such features. Displacement of the affected businesses at the MSF site west side of Broadway between 2nd and 3rd Streets, would receive compensation and relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Business Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. For these reasons, these impacts are considered less than significant.

2.8.5 References

Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's land use and planning impacts.

2.9 Noise and Vibration

2.9.1 Description of Potential Impacts

Construction noise levels would exceed limits specified in the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide. Noise associated with construction would be experienced by receptors in the immediate vicinity of construction activities. Such noise impacts would be experienced for longer periods of time for construction associated with the either of the MSF sites. Construction activities could result in
perceptible levels of groundborne vibration, but physical damage to fragile structures is not expected.

Streetcar operations would generate noise from "wheel squeal" exceeding FTA Moderate impact criteria in the vicinity of the Disney Concert Hall under the Grand Avenue Extension.

Noise generated from activities at the MSF would exceed FTA Moderate impact criteria and CEQA significance thresholds at the Guadalupe Wedding Chapel, if that business were to remain. TPSS operations would not exceed either FTA Moderate criteria or CEQA significance thresholds.

Vibration impacts from streetcar operations could occur inside some sensitive spaces, such as theaters and concert halls.

2.9.2 Mitigation Measures

MM-NV-C1: The contractor shall limit nighttime construction activities (during the hours from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) to generate lower noise levels, which may include, but not be limited to, concrete pouring, field welding, and underground utility work. The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (DPW), Bureau of Engineering (BOE), through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C2: The contractor shall use specialty equipment with enclosed engines and/or high-performance mufflers. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C3: The contractor shall locate equipment and staging areas as far from noise-sensitive receivers as practicable. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C4: The contractor shall limit unnecessary idling of equipment. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C5: The contractor shall install temporary noise barriers to enclose stationary noise sources, such as compressors, generators, laydown and staging areas, and other noisy equipment. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C6: The contractor shall reroute construction-related truck traffic away from residential buildings to the extent practicable. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C7: The contractor shall sequence the use of equipment so that simultaneous use of the loudest pieces of equipment is avoided as much as practicable. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.
**MM-NV-C8:** The contractor shall avoid the use of impact equipment and, where practicable, use non-impact equipment. Non-impact equipment could include electric or hydraulic-powered equipment rather than diesel and gasoline-powered equipment where feasible. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-NV-C9:** The contractor shall use portable noise control enclosures for welding in the construction staging area. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-NV-C10:** If a noise variance from Section 41.40(a) of the *Los Angeles Municipal Code* is sought, a noise limit shall be specified. The contractor shall employ a combination of the above-listed noise-reducing approaches to meet the noise limit. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-NV-C11:** Specific measures to be employed to mitigate construction noise impacts shall be developed by the contractor and presented in the form of a Noise Control Plan. The Noise Control Plan shall be submitted for review and approval before the beginning of construction activities. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-NV-C12:** A preconstruction survey shall be conducted, including an inspection of building foundations and photographs of pre-existing conditions. The survey can be limited to (1) the first row of buildings along the selected alignment and will include the locations of the glass blocks and associated subterranean vaults and (2) buildings within approximately 200 feet of the construction zone that are deemed to be extremely susceptible to vibration, as determined by local authorities. These will be included in the survey.

The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-NV-C13:** Per the *FTA Guidance Manual*, construction vibration shall be limited to the PPV, ranging from 0.12 inch per second for “buildings identifiable as being extremely susceptible to vibration damage” to 0.5 inch per second for “reinforced concrete, steel, or timber” buildings. The contract specifications shall establish appropriate damage risk vibration limits for historic properties within 200 feet of construction. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-NV-C14:** The contractor shall be required to monitor vibration at any building where the lower vibration limit is applicable and at any location where complaints about vibration are received from building occupants. This shall include “special” land uses, such as the Disney Concert Hall and the Colburn School. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.
MM-NV-C15: If the contractor's plan calls for high-vibration construction activities being performed close to structures, the contractor may be required to use alternative procedures that produce lower vibration levels. Examples of high-vibration construction activities include the use of pavement breakers, vibratory compaction, and hoe rams next to sensitive buildings. Alternative procedures shall include the use of non-vibratory compaction in limited areas and concrete saws in place of jackhammers or pavement breakers for demolition. To avoid potential interference with “special” land uses caused by construction vibration, the contractor shall be required to coordinate with building owners to limit high-vibration construction activities to times when sensitive activities are not occurring inside the buildings. For example, the contractor could avoid the use of high-vibration construction equipment during a scheduled performance or recording at the Disney Concert Hall. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-C16: The Contractor shall hire a Mitigation Coordinator to provide notice to venues and sound-sensitive land uses along the corridor at least two weeks in advance of construction activities. The role of the Mitigation Coordinator will be to respond to concerns related to implementation of construction-related mitigation measures. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-O1: The contractor shall install a “low impact” frog, such as a “well designed” flange bearing frog with a ramp angle between 1:20 and 1:100, for special trackwork as well as wheel dampers if wheel squeal occurs. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-O2: The contractor shall use a “low impact” frog, such as a “well designed” flange bearing frog with a ramp angle between 1:20 and 1:100, for all special trackwork within the MSF. Rail lubricators shall be installed at all tight radius curves within the MSF to reduce and control wheel squeal. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

MM-NV-O3: During pre-revenue testing, noise measurements shall be taken at the TPSS units to confirm compliance with the Contract Specification noise level limit of 50 dBA at 50 feet from any side of the TPSS unit. Should exceedances of the noise level limit be found to occur, mitigation options shall be identified and considered, including housing shielding or other suitable methods.

MM-NV-O4: If the track would be less than 1 foot from any part of a building foundation, mitigation measures, such as a resilient mat installed under the trackbed or comparable design measure, would be used. The DPW BOE, through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the DPW Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

2.9.3 Findings

For the above impacts on noise and vibration, the following finding is made:
2.9.4 Rationale

Construction noise impacts would be temporary and transitory, moving from one location to another over the course of the construction period. Noise impacts would be experienced by nearby receptors. A range of mitigation measures would be followed, but impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Construction-related vibration impacts would be adequately controlled through specific mitigation measures. Included among those measures are (a) a preconstruction survey to identify buildings of particular sensitivity; (b) adherence to specified vibration limits; (c) vibration monitoring during construction; (d) use of alternative procedures to reduce the potential for high vibration levels; and (e) surveillance by a Mitigation Coordinator. For these reasons, construction vibration impacts are considered less than significant.

Noise from wheel squeal in the vicinity of the Disney Concert Hall would be sufficiently reduced through installation of a “low impact frog.” For this reason, this impact is considered less than significant.

MSF-related noise impacts at the Guadalupe Wedding Chapel, if that business were to remain, can be effectively mitigated through the use of a “low impact frog.” For this reason, this impact is considered less than significant.

Vibration from streetcar operations can be effectively controlled through special vibration mitigation, with installations including resilient mats under the trackbed or comparable design measures. For this reason, this impact is considered less than significant.

2.9.5 References

Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's noise and vibration impacts.
2.10  Transportation and Traffic

2.10.1  Description of Potential Impacts

Construction activities would result in temporary deterioration of intersection performance at some intersections in the downtown area. Delays associated with lane closures would affect public transit vehicle movement during construction.

Once the streetcar is operational, impacts exceeding LADOT delay significance criteria would occur at three intersections: (1) Hill Street/1st Street, (2) Hill Street/7th Street, and (3) Grand Avenue/1st Street (Grand Avenue Extension only).

Bicycle/rail flangeway conflicts would exist on streetcar segments without designated bicycle lanes and where bicycles and streetcars must share the curb travel lane. These conflicts could result in bicycle tires becoming lodged in the streetcar track flangeways. These situations could occur along Broadway (1st Street to 11th Street) and Hill Street (7th Street to 1st Street).

2.10.2  Mitigation Measures

**MM-TRAF-C1: Develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan.** The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) shall develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to reduce construction-related traffic impacts on public services, community facilities, utilities, bicycle circulation, and pedestrian circulation. The TMP shall be prepared during final design for implementation during construction to mitigate the traffic impacts caused by construction of the Project. The TMP shall identify potential measures such as public awareness and changeable message signs. The TMP shall be developed in consultation with emergency service providers (i.e., local police and fire departments).

The TMP shall address construction duration and activities and include measures such as a temporary traffic signal, bicycle lane detours, or flagmen adjacent to construction activities. The TMP shall also coordinate review of construction activities along cross and parallel streets accordingly. A community affairs entity shall be established to administer a construction impact mitigation program for the benefit of the community. This program shall keep the community informed of all construction activities, with special emphasis on activities that affect the public. The program shall also set up a hotline number with a direct connection to staff familiar with the community and the Project. This entity shall offer individual consultation for residents, facilities, and businesses for remedies appropriate to the impacts encountered. The program shall identify community/business needs prior to and during the construction period through the use of surveys and community meetings. LADOT and the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (LABOE), through the construction contractor per bid specifications, shall be the responsible party. Access to businesses will be maintained during construction. Enforcement shall be achieved through the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-TRAF-C2: Construction Mitigation Monitoring.** A construction mitigation program shall be established with participation of City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (LABOE), Bureau of Contracts Administration, and the construction contractor. All mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported to LABOE on a quarterly basis. The Los Angeles Department of Transportation and LABOE, through the construction contractor per bid
specifications, shall be the responsible party. Enforcement shall be achieved through the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Contracts Administration Bureau Construction Inspector.

**MM-TRAF-01:** Mitigation to be considered would include:

- Signage and pavement markings to alert bicyclists to the presence of streetcar tracks.
- Instruct cyclists to cross tracks perpendicular to the direction of the rails. For left-turning cyclists, pavement markings shall be provided to encourage perpendicular bicycle turning movements, such as “Copenhagen Left” turns. The signage and/or pavement markings would also clearly identify the presence of the flangeway to cyclists traveling parallel to the fixed guideway.
- Alert bicyclists to use parallel bike routes (or Class II bike facilities) where available, such as Spring Street as an alternative to southbound Broadway.
- Recommend alternate routes.

### 2.10.3 Findings

For the above impacts on transportation and traffic, the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The potential impacts on transportation and traffic from the operation of the proposed Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles are found to be

- Significant
- Not Significant

### 2.10.4 Rationale

Construction-period impacts would be controlled through the use of a Construction Traffic Management Plan developed in consultation with emergency service providers (i.e., local police and fire departments) and include measures such as public awareness, changeable message signs (CMS), temporary traffic signals, bicycle lane detours, or using flagmen adjacent to construction activities, as appropriate. For this reason, these impacts are considered less than significant. Adequate mitigation is not available for the operational intersection impacts identified at Hill Street/1st Street, Hill Street/7th Street, and Grand Avenue/1st Street. These impacts are therefore considered significant and unavoidable.

---

2 A Copenhagen Left turn is a two-staged left turn wherein the bicyclist crosses the intersection ahead, stops on the opposite side in the direction he/she wishes to turn, awaits a green light, and crosses the intersection to complete the left turn.
A number of mitigation measures are proposed to lessen the potential hazards associated with the track flangeway/bicycle conflicts. Among these measures are (a) signage and pavement markings to warn bicyclists of the hazard; (b) instructing bicyclists to cross the tracks perpendicularly; and (c) advising bicyclists as to the availability of alternate routes. Despite the application of these mitigation measures, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

References

Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR addresses the Project's transportation and traffic impacts.

3 Alternatives Considered

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an evaluation of the comparative impacts of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project that would feasibly attain most of the Project’s basic objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the Project. A feasible alternative is one that can be accomplished successfully in a reasonable period of time, taking into consideration economic, legal, social, and technological factors. The range of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasonable choice. Chapter 4, Comparison of Alternatives, of the Draft EIR discusses four project alternatives and the No Project alternative that were carried forward in detailed analyses. Draft EIR Chapter 4 also discussed several alternatives that were considered but not carried forward.

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation and Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering have the following objectives for the Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles:

- **Land Use and Economic Development**: Support the growth and revitalization of downtown Los Angeles, including its historic districts, through the following:
  - Revitalize geographically isolated, underutilized areas.
  - Promote smart, sustainable growth that helps to reduce sprawl.
  - Implement transit policies that support the City’s General Plan.
  - Integrate transit and land use within the study area.
  - Encourage historic restoration and transit-oriented development.
  - Strengthen downtown’s economic competitiveness.
  - Foster a more livable downtown.
  - Create a distinctive tourist draw that would expand the economic base of the City and maximize tax revenue.
  - Improve transit access to existing and planned developments.
  - Improve interconnectivity between residential areas, employment and activity centers, and retail services.
  - Help to create a vibrant outdoor ambience that would attract residents and visitors to the streets of downtown Los Angeles.
- **Mobility:** Enhance mobility and transit circulation in downtown Los Angeles through the following:
  - Connect major districts, destinations, and activity centers.
  - Improve transit coverage and circulation.
  - Provide easy to use, localized, high-frequency service.
  - Serve transit-dependent populations.
  - Improve transit accessibility and operational efficiency.

- **Congestion Relief:** Create pedestrian-oriented amenities interconnected with sidewalks and public space that will enhance downtown Los Angeles' distinct identity through the following:
  - Reduce dependency on automobiles by implementing transit services and improving walkability.
  - Increase mobility and accessibility for visitors and people who live and work in downtown.

- **Environmental Benefits:** Protect and improve aspects of the downtown core through the following:
  - Preserve the area's historic significance and revitalize the Historic Core.
  - Reduce automobile trips within downtown.

### 3.1 Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in the Draft EIR

Alternatives that were considered but not carried forward in the Draft EIR included seven feasible alternatives evaluated as part of the *Restoration of Historic Streetcar Service in Downtown Los Angeles Alternatives Analysis* (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority 2012), and a rubber-tired transportation systems management alternative (i.e., local circulator bus). As explained in the Draft EIR, none of these suggested alignments or design variations were determined to be feasible alternatives, as defined by CEQA, and, therefore, were not required to be analyzed in detail in the Draft EIR.

Further information regarding these and other alternatives that have been considered can be found in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR.

### 3.2 Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR

Four build alternatives and the No Project Alternative were analyzed in detail in the Draft EIR. The relative impacts of each alternative were compared to the proposed Project. Under each build alternative, alignments are proposed following various routes depending upon the alternative. The proposed Project is intended to fulfill the four objectives outlined above and in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR: Land Use and Economic Development, Mobility, Congestion Relief, and Environmental Benefits. The following discussion is a brief summary of each of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. Alternative 3: 7th Street without Grand Avenue Extension is one of the four
alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR and is discussed in detailed under Section 3.3, Locally Preferred Alternative.

### 3.2.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative, which is required by Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, represents conditions in the project study area that would remain if the proposed Project would not occur. The No Project Alternative would not support the Land Use and Economic Development objective, because it would not introduce improvements to support the growth and revitalization of downtown Los Angeles, including its historic districts. Particularly, it would not encourage historic restoration and transit-oriented development.

### 3.2.2 Alternative 2: 7th Street with Grand Avenue Extension

The 7th Street with Grand Avenue Extension Alternative would construct and implement streetcar service along an alignment that would begin on Grand Avenue north of 2nd Street adjacent to the Disney Concert Hall, then continue northward until turning east on 1st Street. From 1st Street, the streetcar would turn south on Broadway, traveling to 11th Street where it would turn west and continue on to Figueroa Street. The streetcar would then turn north on Figueroa Street and travel to 7th Street, where it would turn east. From 7th Street, the streetcar would turn north on Hill Street, then continue back to 1st Street, completing the circuit by turning west on 1st Street to return to the streetcar stop on Grand Avenue.

All project objectives would be met under this alternative. Specifically, the 7th Street Alternative with Grand Avenue Extension would support the Land Use and Economic Development objective, as it would support the growth and revitalization of downtown Los Angeles, including its historic districts. Particularly, this alternative would encourage historic restoration and transit-oriented development, would create a distinctive tourist draw that would expand the economic base of the City and maximize tax revenue, would improve transit access to existing and planned developments, and would improve interconnectivity between residential areas, employment and activity centers, and retail services. This alternative would also support the Mobility objective, as implementation of the streetcar would enhance mobility and transit circulation in downtown Los Angeles. The Congestion Relief objective would also be supported under this alternative, given that the streetcar would reduce dependency on automobiles and would increase mobility and accessibility for people who live and work in downtown. Additionally, implementation of this alternative would support the Environmental Benefits objective by reducing automobile trips within downtown and would preserve the area’s historic significance and revitalize the Historic Core.

### 3.2.3 Alternative 4: 9th Street with Grand Avenue Extension

The 9th Street with Grand Avenue Extension Alternative would follow the same alignment as the 7th Street with Grand Avenue Extension Alternative, but it would run eastbound on 9th Street between Figueroa Street and Hill Street, rather than 7th Street. The project alignment would still begin and terminate on Grand Avenue, north of 2nd Street.

The 9th Street Alternative with Grand Avenue Extension would support the project objectives in a way nearly identical to that discussed under the 7th Street Alternative with Grand Avenue Extension. The project objectives related to Land Use and Economic Development, Mobility, Congestion Relief, and Environmental Benefits would all be met under this alternative. However, the City’s Bicycle
Master Plan does not identify 9th Street as a network street. Due to lack of a designated bike lane on 9th Street, there is a potential for increased conflicts between bicycles and the streetcar flangeway gaps, hence the potential for this alternative to be rejected.

3.2.4 Alternative 5: 9th Street without Grand Avenue Extension

Alternative 5 would follow the same alignment as the LPA, but it would run eastbound on 9th Street between Figueroa Street and Hill Street, rather than 7th Street.

The 9th Street Alternative without Grand Avenue Extension would support the project objectives in a way nearly identical to that discussed under the 7th Street Alternative with Grand Avenue Extension. However, without the Grand Avenue Extension, the improvement to transit access and interconnectivity in downtown Los Angeles would be slightly less than with the Grand Avenue Extension. Nonetheless, the project objectives related to Land Use and Economic Development, Mobility, Congestion Relief, and Environmental Benefits would all be met under this alternative. However, the City’s Bicycle Master Plan does not identify 9th Street as a network street. Due to lack of a designated bike lane on 9th Street, there is a potential for increased conflicts between bicycles and the streetcar flangeway gaps, hence the potential for this alternative to be rejected.

3.3 Locally Preferred Alternative

This section presents the LPA, including a discussion of the rationale for the selection and the benefits of the LPA.

The Los Angeles Streetcar, Inc., in cooperation with LABOE, LADOT, and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), have recommended the following as the LPA.

- Alternative 3: 7th Street Alternative alignment (see Figure 1-1) without a Grand Avenue Extension
- Inclusion of Alternative 2, Grand Avenue Extension, remains under consideration as an optional addition to the Project, if additional funding can be identified
- Broadway and 2nd Street MSF site or 11th Street/Olive Street (East) MSF Site
- Station platform locations to be determined as final design of the Project proceeds
- TPSS locations to be determined as final design of the Project proceeds

The recommended LPA for the Project takes into account a variety of competing priorities, including environmental impacts, economic considerations, safety, accessibility, and funding.

According to the environmental analysis, the four proposed build alternatives (2–5) would have nearly equal environmental impacts, with fewer overall traffic impacts associated with the 9th Street Alternative without Grand Avenue Extension (Alternative 5). Given the potential for reduced conflict between bicycles and the streetcar flangeway gaps due to the designated bike lane on 7th Street, Alternative 3 has been identified as the LPA, as it results in lesser impacts related to bicycle safety.

The 7th Street Alternative also provides direct connections to a larger number of destinations in downtown, including the Metro Center rail station, the “Fig at 7th” and “The Bloc” shopping centers, and the under-construction “Wilshire Grand” development. Planned streetscape improvements to
7th Street (unrelated to the Project) will also increase access and convenience for users of the streetcar; no such improvements are currently planned for 9th Street.

Projected ridership for the 7th Street Alternative without Grand Avenue Extension (Alternative 3) is higher than that of the 9th Street Alternative without Grand Avenue Extension (Alternative 5) in opening year 2020, at 4,123 and 3,851 trips per day, respectively—a difference of approximately 270 daily trips. The projected ridership for the 9th Street Alternative with Grand Avenue Extension (Alternative 4) is slightly higher in 2020 than for the 7th Street Alternative with Grand Avenue Extension (Alternative 2), at 5,773 and 5,583, respectively—a difference of 190 daily trips. As funding constraints leave the construction of the Grand Avenue Extension uncertain, the relative ridership benefits of the 9th Street Alternative may not be realized if this build alternative were to be pursued.

It is also recommended that policy-makers approve the proposed Broadway and 2nd Street MSF (see Figure 1-1) as the preferred MSF option, but retain the 11th Street/Olive Street (East) site for further consideration. While the environmental impacts of the remaining potential MSF sites under consideration are approximately equal, preliminary engineering and design work independent of the EIR has identified the Broadway and 2nd Street site (Site 4) as preferable due to its size and location relative to the 11th Street and Olive Street (Site 2). Sites 1 and 3, previously under consideration, are now currently under construction for mixed-use residential developments and are therefore no longer available as potential MSF locations.

4 Statement of Overriding Considerations

As described in Section 2, the LPA would result in the following unavoidable significant adverse impacts after mitigation:

- **Noise**: Construction noise levels would exceed specified limits in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*. Impacts would, however, be temporary and transitory, with impacts moving away from affected locations to the next area of construction. Noise associated with construction of the MSF would be experienced by receptors in the vicinity for longer periods of time. Mitigation measures would reduce overall construction noise impacts, but residual noise impacts could remain.

- **Transportation and Traffic**: Traffic operations at intersections adjacent to construction activities may deteriorate as a result of temporary reduced capacity. Once operational, identified intersections would operate with delays exceeding LADOT impact significance criteria at the following locations:
  - Hill Street/1st Street
  - Hill Street/7th Street
  - Grand Avenue/1st Street (Grand Avenue Extension)

- **Bicycle Safety**: Bicycle/rail flangeway conflicts would exist on street segments without designated bicycle lanes and where bicycles and streetcars must share the curb travel lane. This occurs at the following locations:
  - Broadway – 1st to 11th Streets
  - Hill Street – 7th Street to 1st Street
Conflicts consist of the potential for bicycle tires to become lodged in streetcar track flangeways.

The below stated reasons summarize the benefits, goals and objectives of the Project, and provide the rationale for the benefits of the Project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the adverse environmental impacts of the Project and justify their adoption and certification of the Final EIR.

1. Implementation of the LPA would enhance mobility and transit circulation in downtown Los Angeles, connecting major activity centers and improving transit connections.

2. Implementation of the LPA would supplement and improve the efficiency of the rail and bus service by providing transit connections in downtown once passengers disembark from regional transit services, and by locating stops at shorter intervals at strategic locations near activity and transit nodes.

3. Implementation of the LPA would afford the opportunity for the streetcar to be visually and physically connected and integrated with the surrounding community and provide a more contiguous pedestrian corridor connecting Los Angeles Convention Center at the southwestern end to the Civic Center at the northeastern end, with various commercial, residential, and entertainment areas in between.

4. Implementation of the LPA would provide additional transit service to assist in accommodating the needs of projected population and employment growth in the study area.

5. Implementation of the LPA would provide users the ability to “park once” and circulate throughout downtown by using transit instead of making multiple short trips by automobile and parking in multiple on-street parking spaces.

6. Implementation of the LPA would provide a strong connection between Los Angeles’ past, which was built around the streetcar, and its goals for a more transit-oriented future.

7. Construction and operation of the LPA would represent a substantial infrastructure investment in downtown Los Angeles.

8. Construction and operation of the LPA would provide needed jobs to the local economy.

Accordingly, the City hereby concludes that the LPA’s benefits outweigh and override its unavoidable significant impacts for the reasons stated above. The City reached this decision after having done all of the following: (1) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (2) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the Project, (3) rejected alternatives that do not fully meet the project objectives (4) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (5) balanced the benefits of the Project against their significant and unavoidable impacts.