Thank you for participating in today’s meeting. The Transportation Committee encourages public participation and invites you to share your views on agenda items.

**MEETINGS:** Regular Meetings of the Transportation Committee are held on the third Thursday of each month at 2:45 PM at the Foothill Transit Building (100 S. Vincent Avenue, Suite 200, West Covina, CA 91790). The Transportation Committee agenda packet is available at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Government’s (SGVCOG) Office, 1000 South Fremont Avenue, Suite 10-210, Alhambra, CA 91803, and on the website, [www.sgv cog.org](http://www.sgv cog.org). Copies are available via email upon request (sgv@sgv cog.org). Documents distributed to a majority of the Committee after the posting will be available for review in the SGVCOG office and on the SGVCOG website. Your attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording of your voice.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:** Your participation is welcomed and invited at all Transportation Committee meetings. Time is reserved at each regular meeting for those who wish to address the Committee. SGVCOG requests that persons addressing the Committee refrain from making personal, slanderous, profane, or disruptive remarks.

**TO ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE:** At a regular meeting, the public may comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee during the public comment period and may also comment on any agenda item at the time it is discussed. At a special meeting, the public may only comment on items that are on the agenda. Members of the public wishing to speak are asked to complete a comment card or simply rise to be recognized when the Chair asks for public comments to speak. We ask that members of the public state their name for the record and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the Committee on a single item, the Chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of discussion. The Transportation Committee may not discuss or vote on items not on the agenda.

**AGENDA ITEMS:** The Agenda contains the regular order of business of the Transportation Committee. Items on the Agenda have generally been reviewed and investigated by the staff in advance of the meeting so that the Transportation Committee can be fully informed about a matter before making its decision.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Committee member or citizen so requests. In this event, the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered after the Consent Calendar. If you would like an item on the Consent Calendar discussed, simply tell Staff or a member of the Committee.

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the SGVCOG office at (626) 457-1800. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the SGVCOG to make reasonable arrangement to ensure accessibility to this meeting.*
*MEETING MODIFICATIONS DUE TO THE STATE AND LOCAL STATE OF EMERGENCY RESULTING FROM THE THREAT OF COVID-19: On March 17, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 authorizing a local legislative body to hold public meetings via teleconferencing and allows for members of the public to observe and address the meeting telephonically or electronically to promote social distancing due to the state and local State of Emergency resulting from the threat of the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19).

To follow the new Order issued by the Governor and ensure the safety of Board Members and staff for the purpose of limiting the risk of COVID-19, in-person public participation at the Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for November 19, 2020 at 2:00pm will not be allowed. Members of the public may view the meeting live at [https://youtu.be/OQNYEMf27yw](https://youtu.be/OQNYEMf27yw).

Submission of Public Comments: For those wishing to make public comments on agenda and non-agenda items you may submit comments via email or by phone.

- **Email**: Please submit via email your public comment to SGVCOG Management Analyst, Alexander Fung (afung@sgvcog.org), at least 1 hour prior to the scheduled meeting time. Please indicate in the Subject Line of the email “FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.” Emailed public comments will be part of the recorded meeting minutes. Public comments may be summarized in the interest of time; however, the full texts will be provided to all members of the Committee prior to the meeting.

- **Phone**: Please email your name and phone number to SGVCOG Management Analyst, Alexander Fung (afung@sgvcog.org), at least 1 hour prior to the scheduled meeting time for the specific agenda item you wish to provide public comment on. Please indicate in the Subject Line of the email “FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.” You will be called on the phone number provided at the appropriate time, either during general public comment or specific agenda item. Wait to be called upon by staff, and then you may provide verbal comments for up to 3 minutes.

Any member of the public requiring a reasonable accommodation to participate in this meeting should contact SGVCOG Management Analyst, Alexander Fung, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (626) 457-1800 or email afung@sgvcog.org.
PRELIMINARY BUSINESS  3 MINUTES
1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment *(If necessary, the Chair may place reasonable time limits on all public comments)*
5. Changes to the Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR  2 MINUTES
*It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters*
6. Review Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes: 10/15/2020 *(Page 1)*
   Recommended Action: Review and approve.

PRESENTATIONS  70 MINUTES
*It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters*
7. San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study – Mark Christoffels, Chief Engineer, SGVCOG *(approximately 30 minutes)* *(Page 7)*
   Recommended Action: For information.
8. Foothill Transit Overview – Doran Barnes, Chief Executive Officer, Foothill Transit & Yoko Igawa, Manager of Public Affairs, Foothill Transit *(approximately 20 minutes)* *(Page 20)*
   Recommended Action: For information.
9. Metro North Hollywood-Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project – Scott Hartwell, Project Manager, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority *(approximately 20 minutes)* *(Page 23)*
   Recommended Action: For information.

DISCUSSION ITEM  30 MINUTES
*It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters*
10. Metro Measure R Highway Program Criteria and Measure M Guidelines – Mark Christoffels, Chief Engineer, SGVCOG *(approximately 30 minutes)* *(Page 72)*
    Recommended Action: Discuss and provide direction to staff.

METRO REPORTS  5 MINUTES
11. Oral Report
    Recommended Action: For information only.

LIAISON REPORTS  5 MINUTES
12. Metrolink Report
    Recommended Action: For information only.
    Recommended Action: For information only.
14. Foothill Transit Report *(Page 85)*
    Recommended Action: For information only.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT  5 MINUTES
15. Oral Report
    Recommended Action: For information only.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURN
SGVCOC Transportation Committee Special Meeting Minutes
Date: October 15, 2020
Time: 2:00 P.M.
Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order.
   J. Fasana called the meeting to order at 2:01pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance
   J. Fasana led the Transportation Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

   **Members Present**
   - E. Reece; Claremont
   - D. Liu; Diamond Bar
   - J. Fasana; Duarte
   - S. Mateer; Glendora
   - C. Moss; Industry
   - K. Eich; La Cañada Flintridge
   - P. Chan; Monterey Park
   - R. Guerrero; Pomona
   - J. Pu; San Gabriel
   - G. Olmos; South El Monte
   - D. Mahmud; South Pasadena
   - A. Avery; Temple City
   - A. Wu; Walnut
   - M. Reyes; L.A. County District #1
   - D. Perry; L.A. County District #5

   **Members Absent**
   - A. Ross, Los Angeles County DPW
   - V. Mikhail, City of Glendora
   - J. Nelson, City of Industry
   - S. Pedroza, City of Industry
   - R. Roque, L.A. County District #4
   - H. Balian, Gold Line Construction Authority
   - L. Buch, Gold Line Construction Authority
   - L. De Loza-Gutierrez, Metro
   - M. Echternach, Metro
   - D. Morrissey, Metro
   - T. Nguyen, Metro

   **SGVCOC Staff**
   - M. Creter, Executive Director
   - A. Fung, Staff

   **Guests**
   - A. Ross, Los Angeles County DPW
   - V. Mikhail, City of Glendora
   - J. Nelson, City of Industry
   - S. Pedroza, City of Industry
   - R. Roque, L.A. County District #4
   - H. Balian, Gold Line Construction Authority
   - L. Buch, Gold Line Construction Authority
   - L. De Loza-Gutierrez, Metro
   - M. Echternach, Metro
   - D. Morrissey, Metro
   - T. Nguyen, Metro
4. Public Comment
There were no public comments.

5. Changes to the Agenda Order
There were no changes to the Agenda Order.

CONSENT CALENDAR

6. Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes – 09/17/2020

There was a motion made to approve the 09/17/2020 Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes (M/S: E. Reece/J. Pu)

| Ayes: | Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendora, Industry, La Cañada Flintridge, Monterey Park, Pomona, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, Temple City, Walnut, L.A. County District #1, L.A. County District #5 |
| Noes:  |
| Abstain: |
| No Vote Recorded: | South El Monte |
| Absent: |

[Motion Passed]

ACTION ITEM

7. Elections of FY 2020-2021 Transportation Committee Chair and Vice Chair

There was a motion made to elect San Gabriel City Councilmember, Jason Pu, as the FY 2020-2021 Transportation Committee Chair. (M/S: J. Fasana/A. Wu)

| Ayes: | Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendora, Industry, La Cañada Flintridge, Monterey Park, Pomona, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, Temple City, Walnut, L.A. County District #1, L.A. County District #5 |
| Noes:  |
| Abstain: |
| No Vote Recorded: | South El Monte |
| Absent: |
There was a motion made to elect Claremont City Councilmember, Ed Reece, as the FY 2020-2021 Transportation Committee Vice Chair. (M/S: J. Pu/J. Fasana) [Motion Passed]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes:</th>
<th>Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendora, Industry, La Cañada Flintridge, Monterey Park, Pomona, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, Temple City, L.A. County District #1, L.A. County District #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vote</td>
<td>South El Monte, Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESENTATIONS

8. Metro Fareless System Initiative

Metro Principal Transportation Planner, Doreen Morrissey, and Metro Veteran’s Program Manager, Dennis Tucker, provided a presentation on this item. Metro recently established a task force to explore the possibility of developing a Fareless System Initiative to reduce the transportation cost burden for all residents, increase ridership growth, serve essential workers, and contribute to Southern California’s economic recovery. Over the next few months, Metro staff will survey members of the public, meet with regional partners and stakeholders, research and study costs and implementation considerations, and develop a campaign of ownership, respect, and safety. Once the Metro Fareless System Initiative Proposal is completed, it will be presented to the Metro Board of Directors for consideration.

Key Questions/Discussions:

- A committee member inquired about the funding sources that can support Metro to implement a Fareless System Initiative. Mr. Tucker responded that the Task Force is currently exploring the possibility of pursuing state and federal grants and analyzing internal funding sources within Metro’s various departments. Additional public transit advertisement revenues and cost savings from not having to distribute fare cards and maintain fare collection machines can provide additional funding for the Initiative as well.

- Another committee member inquired about the process Metro plans on undertaking to determine those who can benefit from this Initiative. Ms. Morrissey responded that Metro’s intention is to develop a Fareless System Initiative that would apply to all Metro buses and rails given that 70% of Metro riders are low-income.

- A committee member inquired about the duration of the proposed Fareless System Initiative. Ms. Morrissey responded that the Metro Board of Directors will decide the duration of the Initiative. Ms. Morrissey also mentioned that a survey was recently released to solicit feedback from members of the public.
and Metro received a total of more than 47,000 responses. 92% of the respondents expressed support for a Fareless System Initiative.

- A committee member recommended Metro staff to implement a sequential analysis and understand the proposed Initiative’s impact on Metro’s quality of service given that a fareless program can possibly overwhelm Metro’s system.
- A committee member inquired about the need for external stakeholders involved in the development of the Fareless System Initiative to sign non-disclosure agreements. Mr. Tucker responded that only internal Metro staff are required to sign the non-disclosure agreements.
- A committee member inquired about how Metro would manage non-destination riders in a fareless program. Ms. Morrissey responded that the task force is currently exploring this issue further and mentioned that Kansas City’s transit system experienced an increase in non-destination riders and individuals experiencing homelessness once the libraries closed to protect the public from COVID-19.
- A committee member inquired about fareless programs that have been implemented aside from programs in Denver, Austin, and Trenton. Ms. Morrissey responded that smaller cities and universities typically implement fareless transit programs. The City of Commerce currently implements a local fareless transit program since the 1960s.
- A committee member suggested Metro staff to explore a fareless program’s potential impact on neighboring transit agencies such as Foothill Transit. Ms. Morrissey responded that the task force, which includes representatives from local transit agencies, is discussing the proposed program’s potential impact.

9. Metro Traffic Reduction Study
Metro Senior Director of Office of Extraordinary Innovation, Tham Nguyen, provided a presentation on this item. Metro launched the Traffic Reduction Study to examine traffic reduction methods by managing roadway demand through congestion pricing and high-quality transportation options. The Study aims to explore the possibility and feasibility of implementing a traffic reduction program pilot in Los Angeles County and identify willing local partners to collaborate on a potential pilot program. At the anticipated conclusion of the Study in 2022, a traffic reduction pilot program that reduces traffic, enhances mobility, supports environmental and economic justice, and improves public health and safety will be presented to the Metro Board of Directors for consideration.

10. Gold Line (L Line) Extension Construction Updates
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority Chief Executive Officer, Habib Balian, provided a presentation on this item. The Construction Authority has been working to expand the Gold Line tracks to terminate at Montclair’s Transcenter. Currently, the Gold Line terminates at the Azusa Pacific University/Citrus College Station in Azusa. The project segment from Glendora to Pomona is fully funded and serves as the base contract for the design-build team. The extension from Pomona to Montclair, which would add stations in Claremont and Montclair, can be completed within the design-build contract if additional funding is secured by October 2021.
Constructing the Pomona-to-Montclair Segment would require a total of $550 million. Based on the existing progress, construction of the Glendora-to-Pomona Segment is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2025. If additional funding is secured by October 2021 to include the Pomona-to-Montclair Segment within the design-build contract, the extension to Montclair can be completed by the end of 2028.

Key Questions/Discussions:

- A committee member inquired about the funding sources that can support Metro to implement a Fareless System Initiative. Mr. Tucker responded that the Task Force is currently exploring the possibility of pursuing state and federal grants and analyzing internal funding sources within Metro’s various departments. Additional public transit advertisement revenues and cost savings from not having to distribute fare cards and maintain fare collection machines can provide additional funding for the Initiative as well.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT

11. Oral Report
    Metro Board Director, John Fasana, reported that the draft EIR for the North Hollywood-Pasadena BRT Project will be released on October 26th for a 45-day public review.

LIAISON REPORTS

12. Metrolink Report
    No reports were given for this item.

    A written report was provided.

14. Foothill Transit Report
    Foothill Transit Public Affairs Manager, Yoko Igawa, announced that Foothill Transit will continue services at 99% pre-COVID service levels starting October 18th. All express service and local lines will continue providing service except for those that primarily serve local high schools and middle schools.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

15. Oral Report
    SGVCOG Executive Director, Marisa Creter, reported that the City of Baldwin Park recently launched the GoSGV Bikeshare Program on October 1, 2020. Covina is also scheduled to launch the Bikeshare Program in December 2020. Cities that are interested in launching the Bikeshare Program at no cost can contact SGVCOG staff.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Members of the Transportation Committee expressed their appreciation to Duarte City Councilmember, John Fasana, for his dedication to serve the San Gabriel Valley.

ADJOURN
The meeting adjourned at 3:41pm.
DATE: November 19, 2020

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Marisa Creter, Executive Director

RE: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For information only.

SUMMARY

Measure R funding previously was included for the potential eastward extension of the Metro Gold Line (L Line) from its current terminus in East Los Angeles along the SR-60 freeway to South El Monte. Based on the outcome of the project environmental studies, it was determined by Metro that the SR-60 Gold Line alignment was not a feasible alternative. The Metro Board of Directors subsequently directed staff to provide funding and work with SGVCOG staff to undertake a study to identify alternative transit solutions to solve the mobility needs within the San Gabriel Valley (see Attachment A). Metro’s recently approved FY 2021 budget includes $1.5 million for this study.

BACKGROUND

As part of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project, numerous transit alternatives had been evaluated within the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities. In 2007, the alternatives analysis identified various alternatives including Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Two LRT alternatives, SR 60 and Washington, were studied in the 2014 Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact State/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). Due in part to concerns regarding the SR-60 Alternative raised by the local community, stakeholders and cooperating agencies, the Metro Board of Directors deferred the selection of a locally preferred alternative and directed Metro staff to carry out additional technical work to address the issues.

In 2019, Metro initiated the Supplemental/Recirculated Draft EIS/EIR for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project, which included three LRT alternatives that would extend the Metro Gold Line further east from the existing terminus station at the Atlantic Station in the unincorporated area of East Los Angeles. The project alternatives included:

- SR 60 Alternative – approximately 6.9 miles, would extend the Metro Gold Line to South El Monte traveling along and parallel to the SR-60 freeway;
- Washington Alternative – approximately 8.9 miles, would extend the Metro Gold Line to Whittier via Washington Boulevard; and
- Combined Alternative – approximately 16 miles, proposes the build out of both the SR 60 Alternative and the Washington Alternative.
From the onset, the SR-60 Alternative posed environmental and engineering challenges associated with running along or parallel to the SR-60 freeway, adjacent to sensitive land uses and environmental resources. The concerns were analyzed and reevaluated through several studies beginning with the 2014 Draft EIS/EIR, the 2017 Post Draft EIS/EIR Technical Study, and additional focused technical analyses initiated in 2019.

Due to design constraints, environmental impacts, outreach efforts, and consistency with updated Metro policies, the SR-60 Alternative and Combined Alternative were withdrawn from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 environmental study. In May 2020, the Metro Board directed Metro staff to “prepare a feasibility study to evaluate high quality transit service options to serve the San Gabriel Valley.” This motion was amended by Metro Directors Solis, Fasana, and Barger to transfer funding for this study to the SGVCOG as part of the FY 2021 Metro budget.

Recently, Metro approved the FY 2021 budget, which included $1.5 million in funding for this study. Metro is currently drafting a funding agreement with the SGVCOG to undertake this study which is intended to identify alternative transit solutions to solve the mobility needs within the San Gabriel Valley and continue to work with key stakeholders and the communities in this area to identify alternative transit solutions.

The study will identify and analyze the mobility needs for the San Gabriel Valley that are not currently, nor will be served in the future, by the Gold Line (Eastside and Foothill) and Metrolink rail systems. The study will also identify all existing modes of travel and travel demand, determine where gaps currently exist, and develop transit solutions both near term and long term. The transit alternatives to be evaluated may include, but are not limited to, BRT, LRT, Diesel/Electric Motorized Units (DMU’s), or monorail, as well as the identification of opportunities to connect the transit alternatives to existing/planned transit networks of Metro, Metrolink, and/or Foothill Transit and other local transit agencies.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for this study will be issued later this month with proposal due in January. It is anticipated that a contract award will be made in March and the study will take 18 months to complete. The study will include an extensive outreach program that will include all impacted cities and affected agencies within the study area.

SGVCOG Chief Engineer, Mark Christoffels, will provide a presentation on this item.

Prepared by: Mark Christoffels
Chief Engineer

Approved by: Marisa Creter
Executive Director
ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A – Metro Report on San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study
TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THROUGH: PHILLIP A. WASHINGTON
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

FROM: JAMES DE LA LOZA
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

SUBJECT: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

ISSUE

On May 28, 2020 the Board approved Item #5, San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study, including Motion #5.1 (Attachment A, Legistar File 2020-0368). The motion directed staff to partner with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) to deliver the feasibility study. The study will identify a short- and long-term replacement for the Eastside Transit Corridor Route 60 Alternative which was eliminated from further consideration at the February 2020 Board Meeting.

Staff has begun coordination with SGVCOG and is developing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to create a partnership between Metro and the SGVCOG to procure and complete the study. Metro staff will outline the parameters for Measure M transit capital funding and is working to identify available funds as part of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 budget for the procurement and initiation of the feasibility study subject to budget approval.

BACKGROUND

In February 2020 the Board approved staff recommendations to withdraw the State Route (SR) 60 and Combined Alternatives from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (ESP2) project due to constraints. In addition, the Board approved Motion Item # 8.1 (Attachment B, Legistar File 2020-0172) which directed staff to commence with an independent feasibility study that evaluates
short-term and long-term transit options to serve the mobility needs of the San Gabriel Valley.

The Board Motion identified $635.5 million of Measure M Cycle 2 funding during the "funding years" of the Measure R Expenditure Plan for a short-term transit solution and directed staff to return with a funding plan for the transit feasibility study. As a result, Metro Staff initiated the technical and outreach scope of services for the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study and developed a funding plan which would require a Measure M ordinance amendment.

The Board approved Item # 5 (Attachment C, Legistar File 2020-0255) at the May 2020 Board Meeting which included an update on the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study and the proposed funding plan identifying Measure R and Measure M funding.

Measure M encompasses Measure R funding and provides for two cycles of funding to allow two alignments to be constructed as part of ESP2, but at different points in time. One project to proceed earlier in the Measure M plan ($3 billion in FY29-35) and a second to go forward later ($3 billion in FY53-57) when future sales tax and State funding are projected to be available. The funding plan proposes that the funding commitment of $635.5 million be funded from Cycle 2 Measure M funds for the short-term transit solution. The Measure M ordinance restriction on Cycle 2 construction spending would require an amendment to reallocate funding from Cycle 2 in a clear and transparent manner.

**DISCUSSION**

Staff has initiated coordination with SGVCOG on this partnership and will enter into an MOU that will allow the SGVCOG to procure professional services to support this effort and submit regular invoices to Metro for reimbursement of incurred expenses. Throughout this study, Metro staff will continue to coordinate with the SGVCOG and provide support as needed.

Community and stakeholder engagement is anticipated to be a key component of this effort to be led by the SGVCOG. Completion of the feasibility study is expected to be a multi-year effort that will be initiated in FY21.

**NEXT STEPS**

Metro staff will continue to work with the SGVCOG to develop the MOU consistent with Measure M parameters for transit capital funds and Metro procurement requirements including Metro’s Diversity and Economic Opportunity goals.
As part of the FY21 budget update, staff is working to identify funds for the feasibility study. Authorization for this study to proceed without delay is subject to the approval of funding in the FY21 budget.

Upon completion of the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study, staff will report back to the Board with the results of the feasibility study and proposed amendments to the Measure M ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Legistar File 2020-0368
Attachment B - Legistar File 2020-0172
Attachment C - Legistar File 2020-0255
PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
MAY 20, 2020

Motion by:
DIRECTORS SOLIS AND FASANA

Related to Item 5: San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study

SUBJECT:  SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE Amending Motion by Directors Solis and Fasana

WE THEREFORE MOVE that the Board direct the CEO to report back in 30 days with recommendations to transfer funding to the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments as part of the FY21 budget for the procurement and completion of the Feasibility Study. Recommendations should include provisions typical of Metro procurements such as small, disadvantaged, and/or disabled veteran business enterprise goals.
SUBJECT:  SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY

ACTION:  APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE AND FILE the response to Board Motion Item 8.1 (Attachment A, Legistar File 2020-0172) on the February 2020 Board report, Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 (Attachment B, Legistar File 2020-0027) directing staff to:

1) Prepare a feasibility study to evaluate high-quality transit service options to serve the San Gabriel Valley, and

2) Include recommendations for a Funding Plan for the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities subregions that encompasses Measure R and Measure M funding for Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 to demonstrate subregional equity.

ISSUE

In February 2020 the Board approved the staff recommendations to withdraw the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project (Attachment B) and directed staff to prepare an independent feasibility study that evaluates options to serve the mobility needs of the San Gabriel Valley. The Board approved a Motion (Attachment A) directing staff to return in May 2020 with a plan for the feasibility study and the development of a high-quality transit service option in the San Gabriel Valley subregion including a Funding Plan that encompasses Measure R and Measure M funding. The Board identified $635.5 million of Measure R funding for improvements to be identified in the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study and to be consistent with the funding years in the Measure R Expenditure Plan.

As a result, Metro staff has initiated the development of the technical and outreach scope of services for the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study. The feasibility study is anticipated to commence in Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, with an approximate 18-month schedule, and would identify short- and long-term solutions that serve the mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley. In response to the Board motion, Metro staff has developed a Funding Plan within the parameters identified in the Board motion.
BACKGROUND

Numerous transit alternatives within the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities have been evaluated as part of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project. In 2007, the alternatives analysis identified various alternatives including light rail transit (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT). Two LRT alternatives, SR 60 and Washington Boulevard, were studied in the 2014 Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/EIR). Due in part to concerns regarding the SR 60 Alternative raised by the community, stakeholders, and Cooperating Agencies, the Metro Board deferred the selection of a locally preferred alternative and directed staff to carry out additional technical work to address the issues.

Since that time, Metro conducted additional technical analysis and reinitiated the environmental process. The constraints along the SR 60 freeway became more evident with further technical analysis and in February 2020, the Metro Board approved the withdrawal of the SR 60 and Combined Alternatives from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 environmental study.

Stakeholders and communities along the SR 60 corridor have shown a vested commitment and support for transit in the southern San Gabriel Valley. Metro recognizes the mobility challenges that exist within the San Gabriel Valley and the need to connect the communities in eastern Los Angeles County to the regional transit network. Metro will continue to work with key stakeholders and the communities in the San Gabriel Valley to evaluate and identify mobility solutions.

Funding

Measure M provides $3.976 billion to the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2, to be expended in two cycles:

- Cycle 1 includes $1.086 billion of Measure M and $3 billion estimated project cost for one alignment with a 2029 groundbreaking date and an expected opening date from 2035-37
- Cycle 2 includes $2.89 billion of Measure M and $3 billion estimated project cost with a 2053 groundbreaking date and an opening date from 2057-59

Measure R and Measure M did not provide for splitting the corridor into two concurrent projects. Measure R provided for one corridor to be built with funds conceptually attributable to both sub-regions. Measure M provided additional funding to allow two projects to be constructed, but at different points in time. One project was to proceed earlier in the Measure M plan ($3 billion in FY29-35) and a second to go forward later ($3 billion in FY53-57), when future sales tax and State funding are projected to be available.

DISCUSSION

The February 2020 Board action directed staff to commence an independent feasibility study focused exclusively on a San Gabriel Valley transit project to replace the previous SR 60 Alternative. Metro staff has initiated the development of the scope of services for technical and outreach services and will procure professional services to assist with this effort. The anticipated duration of the study is approximately 18 months. The feasibility study will identify short- and long-term solutions that serve
the mobility needs in the San Gabriel Valley. The feasibility study will allow Metro to continue to work with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, the SR 60 corridor cities, key stakeholders, and the communities in this area to identify alternative transit solutions including but not limited to BRT, LRT, and monorail. These solutions will be developed in close coordination with stakeholders in the San Gabriel Valley.

The study will build upon the analysis and alternatives developed during early work on the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 planning process and will identify alternatives to serve the SR 60 corridor cities and potentially the communities near the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County border. Additionally, the feasibility study will identify opportunities to potentially provide new connections to the Foothill section of Metro L (Gold) Line as well as Metrolink and/or Foothill Transit lines. The potential alternatives will be evaluated in order to identify the most promising transit solutions for the subregion. This effort will be supported by a complementary professional services contract for community and stakeholder engagement utilizing the Communications Bench.

In response to the Board Motion Item #8.1, Metro staff are recommending a funding plan to address the parameters included in the Board motion and provide $635.5 million of funding for the San Gabriel Valley during the "funding years" of the Measure R Expenditure Plan.

Consistency with the Equity Platform

The project is consistent with Metro’s Equity Platform and will work to provide a reliable and high-quality transit alternative to the communities of eastern Los Angeles County to help solve the mobility challenges in the San Gabriel Valley and meet the mobility needs of the area’s residents and businesses. The feasibility study will incorporate Equity Focused Communities and other demographic data to identify and solve mobility challenges consistent with the Equity Platform. Additionally, the study will incorporate the principle of “listen and learn” and will include comprehensive and meaningful engagement opportunities.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study- The FY20 budget does not include funding for the proposed San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study. Staff has identified initial funding sources from Cost Center 4310 (Mobility Corridors Team 1) and is currently working to identify available funds for inclusion in the proposed FY21 budget. Authorization for this study to proceed without delay is subject to the identification and approval of funding in the FY21 budget. Since this is a multi-year program, the Cost Center Manager and Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for budgeting in future years.

San Gabriel Valley Short- and Long-Term Transit Improvements- In response to the Board Motion, Metro staff is recommending a Funding Plan that addresses the following requirements of the motion:

a) Honor the commitment of $635.5 million made to the San Gabriel Valley subregion as part of Measure R documentation;

b) The commitment will be consistent with the funding years in Measure R;
c) Include recommendations for funding and cash flow that encompasses all Measure R and Measure M funding for the project; and,

d) Ensure financial capacity to move the project forward as a Pillar Project.

These requirements are generally understood to require that $635.5 million is made available to the satisfaction of the San Gabriel Valley subregion (i.e., for a transit project that is for the benefit of or is spent within the boundaries of the subregion) during FY22-35, considers funding for both cycles of the project, and does not inhibit the funding of cycle 1.

Given requirement c) above, the commitment could be funded from the cycle 2 Measure M funds, if the Board would support defunding cycle 2. The defunding may reduce the ultimate scope of the cycle 2 project. However, there are several restrictions and important considerations regarding the cycle 2 funds including:

- The Measure M cycle 2 funds (the "Gold Line Eastside Ext. Second Alignment" project funding in the Measure M Expenditure Plan) are not eligible for construction until FY53;

- The cycle 2 funding is programmed in the Metro Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) financial forecast during FY50-57;

- The cycle 1 funding plan is based on preliminary cost estimates from the Expenditure Plan and relies on assumed State grant funding that has yet to be pursued or awarded;

- Moving the Measure M cycle 2 funds from FY50-57 to FY22-35 (the Measure R funding years identified in the Expenditure Plan) will take away funding from both the cycle 2 project and other Board-approved Measure M projects and programs scheduled for FY22-35; and,

- Metro has a policy that the acceleration of Measure M funding cannot negatively impact other Measure M projects.

In order to overcome the ordinance restriction on cycle 2 construction spending, the ordinance can be amended. This would reallocate funding from cycle 2 to cycle 1 in a clear and transparent manner. Alternatively, Metro could consider the trading or swapping of funding as a workaround to the construction spending restriction; however, this creates an administrative need to account for the use of funds that increases the risk of noncompliance with the ordinance, and may not be entirely consistent with the ordinance provisions that specify the amount of Measure M funding by project.

The Funding Plan recommendations are as follows:

1. Retain all funding assigned to the cycle 1 project per the 2019 LRTP financial forecast;

2. Pursue an amendment to the Measure M ordinance that creates a new project or program
(e.g., "San Gabriel Valley Eastside Transit Commitment") with $635.5 million of Measure M transit funding, exclude the funding for this new commitment from the Measure M inflation adjustments allowed by the ordinance, and reduce Measure M funding for the "Gold Line Eastside Ext. Second Alignment" by approximately $700 to $750 million (the precise amount to be determined at the time of the amendment);

3. Pursue a Board action that requires the approval of the San Gabriel Valley subregion of the use of Measure M funding for the commitment;

4. Pursue a Board finding that the addition of $635.5 million for a new San Gabriel Valley Measure M transit commitment, and corresponding reduction of approximately $700 to $750 million from the cycle 2 project does not negatively impact other Measure M projects; and,

5. Defer any of the recommendations upon the completion of the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study.

The amount of the reduction in cycle 2 Measure M funding is greater than the $635.5 million commitment in order to mitigate the financial impact of the acceleration of Measure M funds. The acceleration of funding for the commitment comes at a cost - it will likely result in additional debt financing for Measure M projects and programs, with associated interest cost. The relatively larger reduction in cycle 2 funding in FY50-57 provides capacity to fund the expected additional interest cost.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

This response to the Board Motion supports the Metro Vision 2028 Strategic Plan. Specifically, the project supports Goals #1 and #3 of the Strategic Plan: Goal #1. Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling and Goal #3. Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

By continuing efforts that provide high-quality mobility options, enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to transit, and addressing mobility challenges in San Gabriel Valley, Metro is continuing to work towards equitable and accessible transit services, reduce travel times and roadway congestion, and enhance connections to the regional transit network.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could decide to delay this action. This is not recommended as this would delay the initiation of the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will continue to develop the scope of services for technical and outreach services required to produce the San Gabriel Valley transit feasibility study. Metro staff will report back to the Board with a request for approval proceeding the procurement process and a budget amendment, if required.
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TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Marisa Creter, Executive Director

RE: FOOTHILL TRANSIT OVERVIEW

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

In response to service cuts and fare increases announced by the Southern California Rapid Transit District, 22 San Gabriel Valley and Pomona Valley cities established Foothill Transit in 1988 to assume control of bus operations in the region. Since then, Foothill Transit has expanded to serve more than 1.5 million residents with a service area of 327 squared miles. Currently, the transit agency services 36 local and express routes that result in approximately 12 million boardings per year. A map of Foothill Transit’s service area can be found in Attachment A.

Foothill Transit is also known as the first public transit agency in the United States to deploy three fast-charge, all-electric buses in 2010. The three buses were followed by 12 additional fast-charge buses in 2014, enabling the agency to fully electrify Line 219, which also became the first all-electric, fast-charge bus line in the nation. In 2018, three extended-range buses were also added to the fleet to operate Duarte’s services, which made the City of Duarte the first Southern California city to be fully serviced by an all-electric bus fleet. In the near future, double-deck electric buses will be added to the agency’s fleet. They will first be deployed into express services on the I-10 Corridor, which will significantly increase capacity along the heavily congested corridor and bring highly visible innovative zero-emissions transit vehicles to the Greater Los Angeles region.

Foothill Transit Chief Executive Officer, Doran Barnes, will provide a presentation at this meeting.
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Management Analyst
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DATE: November 19, 2020

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Marisa Creter, Executive Director

RE: METRO NORTH HOLLYWOOD-PASADENA BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PROJECT

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) conducted the Countywide Bus Rapid Transit (CBRT) and Street Design Improvement Study in 2013 to identify and develop recommendations for an effective CBRT system that includes dedicated peak hour bus lanes along with various general bus speed improvements. The Study identified the North Hollywood-to-Pasadena Corridor as the most heavily travelled corridor within a premium bus service. As a result, the Corridor was selected as one of the first to be studied for potential implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

The Corridor extends approximately 18 miles and serves as a key regional connection between the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys with connections to the Metro B (Red), G (Orange), and L (Gold) Lines. It also parallels the SR-134 Freeway and supports more than 700,000 daily trips coming into the study area from both the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys. The Corridor extends from the North Hollywood Metro Red/Orange Line Station to the Pasadena City College, serving cities and communities within North Hollywood, Burbank, Glendale, Eagle Rock, and Pasadena.

Metro conducted the North Hollywood-to-Pasadena BRT Corridor Technical Study in 2017 and initiated the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project in 2019 to study various route options that include street-running and freeway-running segments that will connect the North Hollywood Metro Station to Pasadena City College. The Draft EIR, which can be found in Attachment A, is now available for public review and comment until December 10, 2020. The received comments and recommendations will be considered for the Final EIR that will be conducted in Spring 2021.

The North Hollywood-to-Pasadena BRT Project is funded by Measure M and Senate Bill 1, which provide a total of $267 million in project funding. It is anticipated that this project will be completed in 2024. Metro Deputy Executive Officer of Strategic Financial Planning, Craig Hoshijima, will provide a detailed presentation at this meeting.
Prepared by: ____________________________
Alexander P. Fung
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Approved by: ____________________________
Marisa Creter
Executive Director
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ES. Executive Summary

This Executive Summary is intended to provide the reader with a concise summary of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Project (BRT) (Proposed Project or Project) and its potential environmental effects. It contains the purpose of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a summary of the environmental review process, the project history, project objectives, a description of the Proposed Project, a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures, areas of controversy/issues to be resolved, a comparison of the Proposed Project to alternatives, and a trade-off analysis comparing the Proposed Project and route options.

The Proposed Project would provide a BRT service connecting several cities and communities between the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys. Specifically, the Proposed Project would consist of a BRT service that runs from the North Hollywood B/G Line (Red/Orange) Station in the City of Los Angeles through the Cities of Burbank and Glendale and into the City of Pasadena ending at Pasadena City College. The Proposed Project would operate along a combination of local roadways and freeway sections with various configurations of mixed-flow and dedicated bus lanes depending on location. Figure ES-1 shows the regional context of the Project Corridor.

The Proposed Project includes options for the BRT route and configurations. This was necessary due to public feedback during the completion of the Alternatives Analysis and Draft EIR scoping feedback. It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that all stakeholders and the agency decision-makers would best be informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes.

**ES.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Metro has prepared this Draft EIR to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.). The Draft EIR will inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project, as well as possible ways to minimize those significant effects, and reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project that would avoid or minimize those significant effects. The Draft EIR will also enable Metro to consider environmental consequences when deciding whether to approve the Proposed Project.
Figure ES-1 – Regional Context of the Study Corridor

Metro serves as the lead agency for the Proposed Project and has the principal responsibility for approving the Project. Lead agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental impacts of a project, where feasible. In determining whether to approve a project that would result in significant adverse environmental effects, a lead agency has an obligation to balance the economic, social, technological, legal, and other benefits of a project against its significant unavoidable impacts on the environment.

This Draft EIR is an informational document designed to identify the potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project on the environment; to indicate the manner in which those significant impacts can be minimized; to identify reasonable and potentially feasible alternatives to the Proposed Project that would avoid or reduce the significant impacts; and to identify any significant unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.

**ES.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

In May 2019, an Alternatives Analysis Report, including its findings and recommendations, was presented to the Metro Board of Directors. The Metro Board directed staff to initiate a Draft EIR. In compliance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and distributed on June 14, 2019, to the State Clearinghouse and June 17, 2019, to various other public agencies and the general public for a 45-day review and comment period. During the initial 45-day review period, Metro extended the scoping period for an additional 15 days – officially ending the scoping period on August 15, 2019. Five scoping meetings were held in July 2019 to facilitate public review and comment on the Proposed Project and the Draft EIR. Metro received a total of 2,584 comments during the public scoping period. Generally, comments received were a mix of both supportive and opposed sentiments toward the Proposed Project.

After the public review and comment period, written responses to all written comments and oral testimony pertaining to environmental issues received during the comment period will be prepared as part of the Final EIR. As required by CEQA, responses to comments submitted by commenting agencies will be distributed to the agencies for review prior to consideration of the Final EIR by Metro’s Board.

Upon completion of the Final EIR and other required documentation, the Metro Board may adopt the findings relative to the Proposed Project’s environmental effects after implementation of mitigation measures and statement of overriding considerations, certify the Final EIR, and approve the Proposed Project.

Opportunities for the public to provide comments and participate in virtual public hearings are indicated on the following page.
Public Hearings

Metro will conduct two virtual public hearing to take testimony on the Draft EIR during the public review and comment period. Public hearings will not be in person to promote community safety related to Coronavirus 2019/2020.

The presentation may be viewed during the public review period at:

https://www.metro.net/projects/noon-hollywood-pasadena-corridor/

Virtual public hearings will take place during the following dates and times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Thursday, November 12, 2020</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online link:</td>
<td><a href="https://zoom.us/j/93362737314">https://zoom.us/j/93362737314</a></td>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(877) 853-5247 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(888) 788 0099 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(833) 548 0276 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(833) 548 0282 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar ID:</td>
<td>933 6273 7314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Saturday, November 14, 2020</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online link:</td>
<td><a href="https://zoom.us/j/93255094044">https://zoom.us/j/93255094044</a></td>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(833) 548-0276 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(833) 548-0282 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(877) 853-5247 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(888) 788-0099 (Toll Free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar ID:</td>
<td>932 5509 4044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Comments

The public review and comment period for this Draft EIR is from October 26, 2020 to December 10, 2020. During this period, public agencies, organizations, and individuals may submit written comments concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR to:

Scott Hartwell, Project Manager
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza, Mail Stop: 99-22-6
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email: nohopasbrt@metro.net

You may also call the North Hollywood Pasadena BRT Corridor Project hotline (213) 418-3228 and leave a message.

ES.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Proposed Project would provide improved and reliable transit service to meet the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors who travel within the corridor. In addition to advancing the goals of Metro’s Vision 2028 Strategic Plan, objectives of the Proposed Project include:

- Advance a premium transit service that is more competitive with auto travel
- Improve accessibility for disadvantaged communities
- Improve transit access to major activity and employment centers
- Enhance connectivity to Metro and other regional transit services
- Provide improved passenger comfort and convenience
- Support community plans and transit-oriented community goals
ES.4 PROJECT HISTORY

The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor was identified by Metro’s 2013 Countywide Bus Rapid Transit and Street Design Improvement Study as one of the region’s most heavily traveled corridors without a premium bus service. This led to the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Technical Study, completed in March 2017, which explored the feasibility and performance of implementing BRT, including dedicated bus lanes, enhanced stations, all-door boarding, and transit signal priority. The BRT Corridor Technical Study identified two initial BRT concepts (Primary Street and Primary Freeway), including multiple route options, as the most promising alternatives to address the transportation challenges within this corridor.

The North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT Corridor Planning and Environmental Study was initiated in August 2018 to further study BRT concepts. Metro launched an extensive public outreach effort to provide project updates and to solicit feedback on the two initial BRT concepts identified in the BRT Corridor Technical Study. This outreach effort included five community meetings in addition to approximately 40 individual briefings with the affected cities’ elected officials and other community, business, and neighborhood groups. To broaden the outreach efforts to reach historically underserved communities, the Metro outreach team attended neighborhood events such as street fairs, farmers markets, and music festivals, and shared project information at the North Hollywood Metro B/G Line (Red/Orange) Station.

Field reviews were conducted to evaluate potential routing and station opportunities and constraints, as well as land uses. Concurrently, a comprehensive database of street cross sections, existing transit service characteristics, and other data was assembled and evaluated to inform the screening and evaluation of alternatives in the North Hollywood to Pasadena Alternatives Analysis Report. The results of the initial screening analysis were synthesized into three distinctive refined routes to further study — street-running, freeway-running, and hybrid street/freeway-running. Each of these three routes extended from the Metro B/G Line (Red/Orange) terminus on Lankershim Boulevard and terminated at the Pasadena City College near Colorado Boulevard at Hill Avenue in Pasadena. It was determined that the street-running route best met the Project’s Objectives and would achieve the highest number of overall benefits, including ridership potential, connectivity, transit-orientated community opportunities, equity, and environmental benefits. Promising route segments from the other two screened routes were also recommended to be carried forward, resulting in a refined street-running route with options.

The Alternatives Analysis Report describes routes that were eliminated from consideration. Combined with the feedback received from the various communities, several of the initial routing options were eliminated from further consideration — three from the Primary Street Concept and two from the Primary Freeway Concept. Routes that were eliminated from consideration included, Chandler Boulevard (North Hollywood – Burbank), Magnolia Boulevard (North Hollywood – Burbank), Brand Boulevard (Glendale), Burbank Boulevard – Hollywood Way – Hollywood Burbank Airport – Interstate 5, and Fair Oaks Avenue/Raymond Avenue Couplet (Pasadena).
ES.5 PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Project extends approximately 18 miles from the North Hollywood Metro B/G Line (Red/Orange) Station on the west to Pasadena City College on the east. The BRT corridor generally parallels the Ventura Freeway (State Route 134) between the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys and traverses the communities of North Hollywood and Eagle Rock in the City of Los Angeles as well as the Cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. Potential connections with existing high-capacity transit services include the Metro B Line (Red) and G Line (Orange) in North Hollywood, the Metrolink Antelope Valley and Ventura Lines in Burbank, and the Metro L Line (Gold) in Pasadena. The Project Area includes several dense residential areas as well as many cultural, entertainment, shopping and employment centers, including the North Hollywood Arts District, Burbank Media District, Downtown Burbank, Downtown Glendale, Eagle Rock, Old Pasadena and Pasadena City College.

The Proposed Project would generally include dedicated bus lanes where there is adequate existing street width, while operating in mixed traffic within the City of Pasadena. BRT service would operate in various configurations depending upon the characteristics of the roadways. Route options including in one segment, bus lane configuration options, are evaluated in the EIR in response to input received during completion of the Alternatives Analysis and EIR scoping period: It was not possible to reach a consensus on one route preferred by Metro, the cities, stakeholders, and general public. Metro determined that Metro decision-makers and all stakeholders would best be informed about the Proposed Project by equally evaluating the potential environmental impacts of multiple routes.

Figure ES-2 shows the Proposed Project and route options. Table ES-1 provides the bus lane configurations for each route segment of the Proposed Project and route options.
Figure ES-2 – Proposed Project with Route Options

Table ES-1 – Route Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>BRT Lane Configuration</th>
<th>Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 (Project)</td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>N. Chandler Blvd.</td>
<td>Chandler Blvd.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td>• Western Terminus at North Hollywood Metro Station with connection to Metro B Line (Red) and Metro G Line (Orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>Vineland Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Running¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vineland Ave.</td>
<td>Chandler Blvd.</td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>Center-Running</td>
<td>• Hesby St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>Vineland Ave.</td>
<td>SR-134 Interchange</td>
<td>Center-Running Mixed-Flow³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (Option)</td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>N. Chandler Blvd.</td>
<td>SR-134 Interchange</td>
<td>Side-Running²</td>
<td>• Hesby St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Project)</td>
<td>SR-134 Freeway</td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd.</td>
<td>Pass Ave. (EB)</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C (Project)  | Pass Ave. – Riverside Dr. (EB) Hollywood Wy. – Alameda Ave. (WB) | SR-134 Freeway     | Olive Ave.           | Mixed-Flow⁵               | • Riverside Dr.  
|             |                              |                     |                     |                                        | • Grandview Ave. (optional station)  
|             |                              |                     |                     |                                        | • Pacific Ave.  
<p>| | | | | | |
|             |                              |                     |                     |                                        |                                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>BRT Lane Configuration</th>
<th>Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1</strong> (Project)</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd.</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Mixed Flow Side-Running 7</td>
<td>• Lexington Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Side-Running</td>
<td>• Brand Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Glendale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Verdugo Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2</strong> (Option)</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd.</td>
<td>Colorado St.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow Side-Running 7</td>
<td>• Lexington Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado St. – Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Side-Running</td>
<td>• Brand Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Glendale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Verdugo Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goode Ave. (WB) Sanchez Dr. (EB)</td>
<td>Central Ave.</td>
<td>Brand Blvd.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td>• Harvey Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-134</td>
<td>Brand Blvd.</td>
<td>Harvey Dr.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1</strong> (Option)</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Linda Rosa Ave. (SR-134 Interchange)</td>
<td>Side-Running Center Running 6</td>
<td>• Eagle Rock Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eagle Rock Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Townsend Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2</strong> (Project)</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Linda Rosa Ave. (SR-134 Interchange)</td>
<td>Side-Running</td>
<td>• Eagle Rock Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eagle Rock Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Townsend Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F3</strong> (Option)</td>
<td>SR-134</td>
<td>Harvey Dr.</td>
<td>Figueroa St.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td>• Colorado Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figueroa St.</td>
<td>SR-134</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Figueroa St.</td>
<td>SR-134 via N. San Rafael Ave. Interchange</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1</strong> (Project)</td>
<td>SR-134</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Ave. Interchange</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Oaks Ave.</td>
<td>SR-134</td>
<td>Walnut St.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walnut St.</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Ave.</td>
<td>Raymond Ave.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond Ave.</td>
<td>Walnut St.</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd. or Union St./Green St.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td>• Holly St. - Metro L Line (Gold)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>BRT Lane Configuration</th>
<th>Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado Blvd. or Union St./Green St.</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd. Interchange</td>
<td>Raymond Ave.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Union St. (WB) Green St. (EB)</td>
<td>Raymond Ave.</td>
<td>Hill Ave.</td>
<td>Mixed-Flow</td>
<td>Los Robles Ave. Lake Ave. Eastern Terminus at Hill Ave. near Pasadena City College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:
1. Eastbound side-running BRT lane between Fair Ave. and Vineland Ave.
2. Westbound mixed-flow BRT operations between Vineland Ave. and Lankershim Blvd.
3. Southbound mixed-flow BRT operations south of Kling St. and northbound mixed-flow BRT operations south of Hortense St.
4. Side-running BRT lanes transition to curb-running BRT lanes to the south of Huston St.
5. The eastbound BRT on Riverside Dr. transitions from mixed-flow to a curb-running BRT lane to the east of Kenwood Ave.
6. Curb-running BRT lanes transition to median-running BRT lanes at Providencia Ave.
7. Transitions from mixed-flow operations to side-running BRT to the south of Sanchez Dr.
8. Route continues via Broadway to Colorado Blvd./Broadway intersection (Project Route F2 and Route Option F1) or via SR-134 (Route Option F3).
9. Side-running BRT lanes transition to center-running BRT lanes between Ellenwood Dr. and El Rio Ave.
10. Route option is a couplet that would leave/join Colorado Blvd. via St. John Ave.
11. Los Robles Ave. station would not be included if paired with Route Option G2.
12. Route would transition to Colorado Blvd. at St. John Ave. if paired with Route Option G2.
13. Los Robles Ave. station would not be included if paired with Route Option G2.
ES.6 LANE CONFIGURATIONS AND TREATMENTS

The configuration of dedicated bus lanes could be curb-running, side-running alongside existing parking and/or bicycle facilities, and/or center/median-running in the center of the roadway or alongside existing roadway medians. The treatments for the Proposed Project and treatment options being assessed in the Draft EIR are shown in Table ES-2.

Table ES-2 – Lane Configuration and Treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center-Running</th>
<th>Median-Running</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center-running bus lanes typically provide two lanes (one for each direction of travel) in the center of the roadway. Center-running bus lanes may be physically separated from adjacent traffic by short raised-curbs to provide an exclusive guideway for BRT vehicles or can simply be delineated with pavement markings. In order to preclude roadway traffic from turning across the bus lanes, a physical barrier such as a short raised-median barrier between the two bus lanes may be provided. Cross-street and turning traffic is usually limited to signalized intersections; pedestrian crossings are signal-controlled as well, using traffic signals or hybrid pedestrian beacons. Left-turns across the busway are usually signal-controlled with turns made from left-turn pockets outboard from the bus lane.</td>
<td>In median-running segments, the BRT service operates within dedicated lanes adjacent to a median (i.e., the left-most lane in the direction of travel). Stations can be placed within the median (for buses with left-hand side doors). Alternatively, the median can be reconfigured in the station area to provide loading islands located outside of the bus lanes (for buses with standard right-hand side doors.) A median-running bus lane may also be physically separated from parallel roadway traffic in a defined guideway through the use of short raised-curbs or rumble strips. Similar to the center-running configuration, cross-street and turning traffic is usually limited to signalized intersections; pedestrian crossings are signal-controlled as well, using traffic signals or hybrid pedestrian beacons. Left-turns across the busway are usually signal-controlled with turns made from left-turn pockets outboard from the bus lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-Running</td>
<td>Curb-Running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-running bus lanes dedicate the right-most travel lane to BRT vehicles. Side-running bus lanes are separated from the curb by bicycle lanes, parking lanes, or both, and may allow for right-turns to be made from the curb lane at intersections reducing conflicts with buses. Otherwise, right-turns are allowed to be made from the bus lane. Because station placement is adjacent to the sidewalk, stations are typically developed with bulb outs or curb extensions, enhancing walkability and the pedestrian environment. Station siting and design treatment should minimize conflicts with cyclists, parked vehicles, commercial loading zones/vehicles, and right-turning traffic.</td>
<td>Curb-running bus lanes place the dedicated bus lane immediately adjacent to the curb, which eliminates parking or restricts parking to time periods when the bus lane is not operational. Like the side-running bus lanes configuration, a curb extension may be provided; however, operation along the curb may preclude development of a bulb out. This type of runningway can experience friction or interaction with cyclists, parked vehicles, commercial loading zones/vehicles, and right-turning traffic, which typically merges into the bus lane prior to turning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mixed-Flow**

Mixed-flow operation may be provided along the BRT route where buses need to transition from one busway configuration to another such as from center-running to side-running, where buses may need to weave into another lane to make a turn, or where traffic operational or geometric constraints make provision of a dedicated lane impractical. In mixed-flow sections, transit priority at intersections may still be provided to facilitate BRT operations.

![Illustrations](image1.jpg)

Illustrations have been developed to visually show how the Proposed Project would be incorporated into the communities. These illustrations are shown in Figure ES-3 through Figure ES-13.
Figure ES-3 – North Hollywood – Vineland Avenue and Lankershim Boulevard Pre-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020

Figure ES-4 – North Hollywood – Vineland Avenue and Lankershim Boulevard Post-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020
Figure ES-5 – Burbank – Olive Avenue Pre-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020

Figure ES-6 – Burbank – Olive Avenue Post-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020
Figure ES-7 – Glendale – Glenoaks Boulevard Pre-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020

Figure ES-8 – Glendale – Glenoaks Boulevard Post-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020
Figure ES-9 – Glendale – Broadway and Colorado Street Pre-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020

Figure ES-10 – Glendale – Broadway and Colorado Street Post-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020
Figure ES-11 – Eagle Rock – Colorado Boulevard Pre-Project

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020
Figure ES-12 – Eagle Rock – Colorado Boulevard Post-Proposed Project
(Side-Running Configuration)

SOURCE: Kilograph, 2020
ES.7 TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY

TSP expedites buses through signalized intersections and improves transit travel times. Transit priority is available areawide within the City of Los Angeles and is expected to be available in all jurisdictions served by the time the Proposed Project is in service. Basic functions are described below:

- **Early Green**: When a bus is approaching a red signal, conflicting phases may be terminated early to obtain the green indication for the bus.
- **Extended Green**: When a bus is approaching the end of a green signal cycle, the green may be extended to allow bus passage before the green phase terminates.
Transit Phase: A dedicated bus-only phase is activated before or after the green for parallel traffic to allow the bus to proceed through the intersection. For example, a queue jump may be implemented in which the bus departs from a dedicated bus lane or a station ahead of other traffic, so the bus can weave across lanes or make a turn.

ES.8 ENHANCED STATIONS

Metro BRT stations are designed to create a comfortable and safe environment for passengers, fulfilling both a functional and aesthetic need. The stations are distinguishable from competing street elements, yet complementary with the surrounding environments. Station amenities associated with the Proposed Project would be designed using a kit of part approach, similar to Metro rail stations. Although the kit of parts approach is under development by Metro, station elements as described below would be utilized to establish a minimum requirement of baseline amenities for platforms. At locations with higher ridership or where space allows, additional enhanced amenities would be provided to support the Proposed Project. Stations siting would allow for safe and accessible paths of travel for transit riders including those accessing stations on foot, bike and other rolling modes.

It is anticipated that the stations servicing the Proposed Project may include the following elements:

- Canopy and wind screen
- Seating (benches)
- Illumination, security video and/or emergency call button
- Real-time bus arrival information
- Bike racks
- Monument sign and map displays

Metro is considering near-level boarding which may be achieved by a combination of a raised curb along the boarding zone and/or ramps to facilitate loading and unloading. It is anticipated that BRT buses would support all door boarding with on-board fare collection transponders in lieu of deployment of ticket vending machines at stations.

The Proposed Project includes 35 possible station sites. This includes 21 potential stations along with two optional (future infill) stations along the Proposed Project route, plus an additional 12 potential station locations along route option segments, as indicated in Table ES 3. Of the 21 proposed stations, four would be along islands within the street, and the remaining 17 stations would be along the sidewalk, with curb extensions at some locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Proposed Project Stations</th>
<th>Route Option Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>North Hollywood Transit Center (Metro B/G Lines (Red/Orange) Station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(City of Los Angeles)</td>
<td>Vineland Ave./Hesby St.</td>
<td>Lankershim Blvd./Hesby St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Burbank</td>
<td>Olive Ave./Riverside Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olive Ave./Alameda Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olive Ave./Buena Vista St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olive Ave./Verdugo Ave. (optional station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olive Ave./Front St. (on bridge at Burbank-Downtown Metrolink Station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olive Ave./San Fernando Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd./Alameda Ave.</td>
<td>Goode Ave. (WB) &amp; Sanchez Dr. (EB) west of Brand Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd./Western Ave.</td>
<td>Central Ave./Americana Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenoaks Blvd./Grandview Ave. (optional station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Ave./Lexington Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway/Brand Blvd.</td>
<td>Colorado St./Brand Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway/Glendale Ave.</td>
<td>Colorado St./Glendale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway/Verdugo Rd.</td>
<td>Colorado St./Verdugo Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 134 EB off-ramp/WB on-ramp west of Harvey Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Rock</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Eagle Rock Plaza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(City of Los Angeles)</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Eagle Rock Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Townsend Ave.</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Figuroa St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond Ave./Holly St. (near Metro L Line (Gold) Station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Arroyo Pkwy.</td>
<td>Union St./Arroyo Pkwy. (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green St./Arroyo Pkwy. (EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Los Robles Ave.</td>
<td>Union St./Los Robles Ave. (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green St./Los Robles Ave. (EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado Blvd./Lake Ave.</td>
<td>Union St./Lake Ave. (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green St./Lake Ave. (EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasadena City College (Colorado Blvd./Hill Ave.)</td>
<td>Pasadena City College (Hill Ave./Colorado Blvd.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 With Fair Oaks Ave. interchange routing.
2 With Colorado Blvd. interchange routing.
3 This location could also accommodate boardings for the Proposed Project.
ES.9 DESCRIPTION OF CONSTRUCTION

Construction of the Proposed Project would likely include a combination of the following elements dependent upon the chosen BRT configuration for the segment: restriping, curb-and-gutter/sidewalk reconstruction, right-of-way (ROW) preparation, pavement improvements, station/loading platform construction, landscaping, and lighting and traffic signal modifications. Generally, construction of dedicated bus lanes consists of pavement improvements including restriping, whereas ground-disturbing activities occur with station construction and other support structures. Existing utilities would be protected or relocated. Due to the shallow profile of construction, substantial utility conflicts are not anticipated, and relocation efforts should be brief. Construction equipment anticipated to be used for the Proposed Project consists of asphalt milling machines, asphalt paving machines, large and small excavators/backhoes, loaders, bulldozers, dump trucks, compactors/rollers, and concrete trucks. Additional smaller equipment may also be used such as walk-behind compactors, compact excavators and tractors, and small hydraulic equipment.

The construction of the Proposed Project is expected to last approximately 24 to 30 months. Construction activities would shift along the corridor so that overall construction activities should be of relatively short duration within each segment. Construction activities would likely occur during daytime hours. Nighttime activities are not anticipated to be needed to construct the Proposed Project. However, at this stage of the planning process and without a construction contractor, it cannot be confirmed if nighttime construction would be necessary for specialized construction tasks. For these specialized construction tasks, it may be necessary to work during nighttime hours to minimize traffic disruptions. Traffic control and pedestrian control during construction would follow local jurisdiction guidelines and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook. Published under the authority of the WATCH Committee of Public Works Standards, Inc., the Handbook is a leading source of information for traffic control in low-speed/short-duration work areas. It provides quick reference traffic control guidelines for work activities for contractors, cities, counties, utilities and other agencies responsible for such work. Typical roadway construction traffic control methods would be followed including the use of signage and barricades.

It is anticipated that publicly owned ROW or land in proximity to the Proposed Project’s alignment would be available for staging areas. Because the Proposed Project is anticipated to be constructed in a linear segment-by-segment method, there would not be a need for large construction staging areas in proximity to the alignment.

ES.10 DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS

The Proposed Project would provide BRT service from 4:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. or 21 hours per day Sunday through Thursday, and longer service hours (4:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m.) would be provided on Fridays and Saturdays. The proposed service span is consistent with the Metro B Line (Red). The BRT would operate with 10-minute frequency throughout the day on weekdays tapering to 15 to 20 minutes frequency during weekday evenings (after 7:00 p.m.), and with 15-minute frequency during the day on weekends tapering to 30 minutes on weekend evenings. The
BRT service would be provided on 40-foot zero-emission electric buses with the capacity to serve up to 75 passengers, including 35-50 seated passengers and 30-40 standees, and a maximum of 16 buses are anticipated to be in service along the route during peak operations. Charging infrastructure would be available at the North Hollywood Station and Pasadena City College termini as well as at the Metro El Monte (Division 9) facility, which is where it is expected that buses would be stored. The Proposed Project has an anticipated opening date in 2024.

When operations commence in 2024, it is possible that the fleet would consist of compressed natural gas (CNG) buses until zero-emission electric buses become available. The employment of CNG buses would be temporary and would not represent long-term operational conditions. The Metro Board in 2017 unanimously adopted a motion endorsing a comprehensive plan to transition the agency to a 100 percent zero emission bus fleet by 2030.

**ES.11 RIDERSHIP**

The Proposed Project is forecast to attract 34,950 boardings in 2042. Transportation modeling was also completed for the route options. It was determined that the route options would attract less ridership, but the associated regional vehicle miles traveled would not significantly change compared to the Proposed Project. The difference in regional vehicle miles traveled was approximately 0.003 percent for all route options.

**ES.12 PROJECT COST AND FUNDING**

The Proposed Project is funded by Measure M and Senate Bill 1, which provide a total of $267 million in funding.

**Capital Costs**

Capital costs for the Proposed Project were estimated based on the Concept Plans. The approach for developing the capital cost estimate used the Standard Cost Category format developed by the Federal Transit Administration, which captures both the “hard” infrastructure construction costs of a project and the “soft” costs like professional services, right-of-way acquisition, contingency, and inflation. An individual estimate was prepared for each route segment (and segment options) to capture and identify the costs associated with each segment, and to assist in the evaluation of the segment options. There are several project costs that are not attributable to an individual segment, therefore an estimate was prepared for “overall” project items, including the bus vehicles and spare parts allowance.

---

1. Charging infrastructure is currently being designed for installation at North Hollywood Station for the Metro G Line (Orange) and additional bus service that accesses this station. Charging infrastructure could potentially be accommodated by displacing a number of surface parking spaces at Pasadena City College, with mast arms extending to the identified layover-loading zone along Hill Avenue. At the El Monte facility, Metro will be installing charging infrastructure in conjunction with the systemwide conversion to electric bus operations.
The results of the conceptual capital cost estimates for the Proposed Project and Route Options indicate a range of approximately $253 million to $371 million, including contingencies and escalation. The level of detail of the capital cost estimates corresponds with the current level of definition, engineering, and environmental analysis that has been completed for the Project. The level of estimating detail would increase as the project design and engineering advances.

**Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs**

An O&M cost model was developed to estimate the annual cost to operate, maintain and administer the Proposed Project. O&M costs are expressed as the annual total of employee wages and salaries, fringe benefits, contract services, materials and supplies, utilities and other day-to-day expenses incurred in the operation and maintenance of a transit system. O&M costs include costs directly related to the provision of transit service (e.g., bus operators and mechanics), and an allocation of administrative functions to each mode of service that is related to the provision of transit service (e.g., customer service, finance and accounting).

The BRT O&M cost model uses the following service supply characteristics as inputs for estimating annual O&M costs:

- Annual Revenue Bus-Hours
- Annual Revenue Bus-Miles
- Peak Buses
- BRT Station Platforms
- BRT Directional Lane Miles
- BRT Maintenance Facilities (Garages)

The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the Proposed Project’s BRT service ranges from $16.6 million to $18.5 million.

**ES.13 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

**Areas of Controversy**

Known areas of controversy associated with the Draft EIR include:

- **Loss of travel lanes**: Travel lanes would be converted into BRT lanes at various locations along the 18-mile alignment including Glenoaks Boulevard, Central Avenue and Broadway in Glendale.

- **Bicycle lane changes**: Under the Proposed Project, a Class II bicycle lane (striped buffer separating bicycle lanes from vehicle lanes) in the Eagle Rock community of the City of Los Angeles would be converted to a multimodal shared bus/bicycle lane. This change would occur under Route Option F2 on Colorado Boulevard.
• **Medians**: Under the Proposed Project, Vineland Avenue would be reconstructed in the City of Los Angeles and the existing raised medians would be removed in order to accommodate new center-running bus lanes. Median modifications would also occur at intersections along Glenoaks Boulevard in the City of Glendale under the Proposed Project and along Colorado Boulevard in Eagle Rock under Route Option F1. During the scoping period, comments were submitted to Metro opposed to median removal.

• **Construction activities**: Controversial construction effects include business access, air pollution, and noise.

• **Parking**: Parking loss is not an issue addressed in the CEQA Guidelines and therefore not addressed in the Draft EIR. Metro acknowledges that parking loss affects businesses and residents in the corridor. The Project Description of the Draft EIR characterizes locations of potential parking loss. This information will be provided to Metro Board for consideration when considering approval of the Proposed Project.

**Issues to be Resolved**

Issues to be resolved associated with the Draft EIR include:

• **Maintenance Facility**: Metro has capacity for maintaining Proposed Project buses at multiple existing facilities. The specific facility has not been identified at this time, although the likely location is the existing Metro bus facility in El Monte.

• **Electric Buses**: Metro is committed to a fully electrified bus fleet by 2030. The specific implementation date for the Proposed Project has not been identified and natural gas may be used to power buses in the 2024 opening year.

• **Potential charging station at Pasadena City College**: Metro and Pasadena City College are discussing a charging station at the terminus by the campus. The environmental effects of the potential charging station are considered in this document.

**ES.14 COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ROUTE OPTIONS**

A high-level analysis has been completed to compare the Proposed Project and the route options. **Table ES-4** shows various metrics, including mobility, transit orientated communities, cost, and transportation facilities. **Table ES-5** shows the potential environmental effects associated with the Proposed Project and the route options. This information would be considered by the Metro Board of Directors when determining if the Proposed Project will be approved for implementation. The metrics are described below:
### Table ES-4 – Comparison of Route Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Alt.</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Transit Oriented Communities</th>
<th>Costs and Effects</th>
<th>Transportation Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Segment Travel Time</td>
<td>Travel Time Reliability</td>
<td>Station Boardings</td>
<td>Transit Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Rock</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- ✓ - Best performing route option(s) for the segment
- x - Poorest performing route option(s) for the segment

**SOURCE:** Kimley-Horn, 2020.
Mobility Benefits

- **Travel Time** – The evaluation is based upon the 2042 projected AM peak period segment travel time. Travel time differences of 30 seconds or more were considered.

- **Travel Time Reliability** – Segments with dedicated bus lanes provide higher reliability. Freeway segments would have low reliability due to peak hour congestion resulting in high variability.

- **Station Boardings** – The evaluation is based upon the total projected boardings for all stations within a particular route segment.

Transit Oriented Communities Benefits

- **Transit Connectivity** – Reflects transit integration and opportunities to transfer to other services based upon stations included in the segment.

- **First/Last Mile** – The evaluation considers walk and bike access to stations within the segment.

- **Economic Potential** – Reflects the economic potential of stations within the segment considering development patterns, land values and real estate trends, and the potential of the BRT to catalyze community development.

Cost and Effects

- **Capital Cost** – Indicates route options with higher or lower capital cost.

- **Traffic & Circulation** – The evaluation considers potential increased congestion associated with conversion of general-purpose lanes to dedicated bus lanes as well as modifications to circulation patterns resulting from reconfiguration of roadways along the BRT route to accommodate bus lanes.

- **Parking** – Reflects the potential for potential loss of parking due to reconfiguration of the roadway along the BRT route to accommodate bus lanes.

- **Bicycles** – Indicates route options which may have a beneficial or negative effect on existing and planned bicycle facilities along the BRT route.

- **Pedestrians & Streetscape** – Reflects potential effects such as sidewalk narrowing to accommodate bus lanes as well as modifications to roadway medians and sidewalk areas which may result in the elimination of existing landscape.

Key observations regarding the indicated trade-offs in each of the five segments where route options are defined are as follows:

- **North Hollywood** – The proposed project route option A1 via Chandler Boulevard to Vineland Avenue to Lankershim Boulevard is slightly slower and more costly than route option A2 entirely via Lankershim Boulevard but, unlike route option A2, does not reduce the number of through lanes on Lankershim Boulevard north of Camarillo Street. The proposed project route option A1 retains all through lanes and also adds a
Class IV cycle track for bicycles along Vineland Avenue, so A2 was indicated as having poorer performance for bicycles. Route option A2 reduces travel lanes on Lankershim Boulevard north of Camarillo Street and would reduce sidewalk widths along Lankershim Boulevard south of Camarillo Street. There would be some loss of parking associated with either option.

- **Glendale** – The proposed project route option E1 via Central Avenue to Broadway would provide similar travel time benefits as route option E2 via Central Avenue to Colorado Street. No negative effects were identified for bicycles; however, the proposed project route option E1 would provide a dedicated bus lane along Broadway which would provide more protection for cyclists compared to the existing condition in which cyclists share the road along this route which is designated as a Class III facility in the Glendale bicycle plan. Contrasting either of these route options to route option E3 via Central Avenue connecting to the SR-134 freeway at Brand Boulevard and following the freeway to Harvey Drive, the E3 freeway option would have the fastest travel time and lowest construction cost, but would have relatively poor travel time reliability, low ridership, poor transit connectivity, and poor first/last mile station access.

- **Eagle Rock** – Route options F1 and F2 would both follow Colorado Boulevard through Eagle Rock, however the configuration for the proposed project, F2, would preserve the travel lanes along the roadway to provide two continuous through lanes along with a shared bus and bicycle lane, which would remove the existing Class II bicycle lane where present (it is discontinuous). Route option F2 would also retain all of the existing parking (with minor losses at stations) and would not conflict with the ATP Cycle 2 improvements under development by the City of Los Angeles. The alternative configuration in route option F1 would retain a narrowed buffered Class II bike lane as well as two continuous through lanes but would result in loss of about one half of the on-street parking as well as the raised landscaped median east of Eagle Rock Boulevard to accommodate side-running bus lanes from Broadway to Ellenwood Drive transitioning to center-running bus lanes from El Rio Avenue to Dahlia Drive (westbound) or Linda Rosa Avenue (eastbound). Left turns across the bus lane would be restricted to major intersections and various minor cross streets; however, turn pockets would be provided for left-turn movements improving safety. By contrast, route option F3, which would be routed via the SR-134 freeway exiting at the Figueroa Street interchange to serve a station at the Figueroa Street / Colorado Boulevard intersection, would have the fastest travel time and lowest construction cost, but would have poorer ridership, less travel time reliability, less transit connectivity and poorer first/last mile station access compared to either route option F1 or F2.

- **Pasadena** – The proposed project route option G1 via the Fair Oaks Avenue interchange to Walnut Avenue to Raymond Avenue would have a longer travel time compared to route option G2 via the Colorado Boulevard interchange and it would be more costly with an added station along Raymond Avenue at Holly Street adjacent to the Memorial Park L Line (Gold) station. However, because of this station, route option G1 would have higher ridership and transit connectivity compared to route option G2.
The proposed project route option H1 via Colorado Boulevard would have a similar travel time, but lower travel time reliability compared to the route option H2 routed via the Green Street / Union Street couplet; however, route option H1 via Colorado Boulevard would have higher ridership. There would be no other substantial differences.

Table ES-5 provides a summary of the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project and each route option. Table ES-6 provides a summary of the impact statements associated with each route option. This table shows that the environmental impacts in North Hollywood for Route Options A1 and A2 are similar. In Glendale, Route Option E3 would be the least environmentally impactful route while Route Options E1 and E2 would have similar impacts. In Eagle Rock, Route Option F3 would be the least environmentally impactful route. Route Option F2 would be slightly less environmentally impactful than Route Option F1. In Pasadena, Route Options G1, G2, H1, and H2 would all have similar environmental impacts.

**ES.15 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

No significant and unavoidable impacts have been identified in the Draft EIR.

**ES.16 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

This Draft EIR has been prepared by Metro to analyze the potential significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and to identify mitigation measures capable of avoiding or substantially reducing significant impacts.

Potential impacts of the proposed project have been divided into three categories: significant unavoidable impacts, significant impacts that can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels and impacts that are less than significant or non-existent.

The criteria for the determination of a significant impact in each environmental topic area are discussed in Chapter 3.0 Environmental Impact Analysis and Chapter 4, Other Environmental Considerations. Table ES-7 provides a summary of the potential environmental impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance after mitigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project/Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>E1 (Proposed Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project/Alternative</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project/Alternative</td>
<td>Environmental Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project and Route Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>H1 (Proposed Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: NI – No impact, LTS – Less-than-significant impact, LTSM – Less-than-significant impact with Mitigation

### Table ES-6 – Summary of Impact Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Significant and Unavoidable Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Rock</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table ES-7 – Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impact After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AESTHETICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project and Route Option E2 would result in removal of historic streetlights considered important visual resources along Central Avenue and Broadway in Glendale, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>CUL-1:</strong> Project design related to potentially historic streetlights and station platforms located immediately adjacent (i.e., on or directly in front of) known or potential historical resources identified in the Historical Resources Project Area shall be reviewed by a qualified architectural historian (individual who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in Appendix A of 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61) to determine consistency with the rehabilitation treatment under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and confirm the Proposed Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The results of this review shall be provided to Metro in a memorandum prepared by the qualified architectural historian conducting the review. This review shall be completed prior to the preparation of final construction documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Route Option F1 would replace the existing median with the proposed center-running bus lanes and associated station platforms resulting in the removal of an important visual resource to the Eagle Rock community in the City of Los Angeles, a potentially significant impact. | **VIS-1:** Plant material removed from center medians and sidewalks shall be replaced within the existing street/curb right-of-way based on the following requirements:  
  - Plant one new tree and/or shrub for every street tree removed (1:1 tree replacement ratio). Replacement tree species should be the same as that removed or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction’s Bureau of Street Services and located within the street right-of-way along station approaches or within the sidewalk.  
  - Plant groundcover using similar replacement species or to the satisfaction of the affected jurisdiction’s Bureau of Street Services.  
  - A Landscape Replacement Study shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect during final design. The study shall identify the location, species, and landscape design elements for all replacement landscaping associated with the Proposed Project and subject to local jurisdiction review. 

**VIS-2:** Replacement median, barriers, or other divider shall be enhanced with patterns or decorative features in accordance with the local jurisdiction’s streetscape design guidelines and approved by local jurisdiction Street Services bureau or similar entity. | Less Than Significant |
### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impact After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Construction of the Proposed Project or Route Options A2, E2, F1, G2, and H2 would result in the removal of street trees used by migratory birds and bats for nesting, a potentially significant impact. | **BIO-1**: To mitigate for construction impacts on special-status bird species, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures:  
- Construction during bird nesting season (typically February 1 to September 1) would be avoided to the extent feasible. Feasible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner taking into consideration costs and schedule.  
- If construction is required during the nesting season, vegetation removal would be conducted outside of the nesting season (typically February 1 to September 1), wherever feasible. Feasible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner taking into consideration costs and schedule.  
- If construction, trimming, or removal of vegetation and trees are scheduled to begin during nesting bird season, nesting bird surveys would be completed by a qualified biologist no more than 72 hours prior to construction, or as determined by the qualified biologist, to determine if nesting birds or active nests are present within the construction area. Surveys would be conducted within 150 feet for songbirds and 500 feet for raptors, or as otherwise determined by the qualified biologist. Surveys would be repeated if construction, trimming, or removal of vegetation and trees are suspended for five days or more.  
- If nesting birds/raptors are found within 500 feet of the construction area, appropriate buffers consisting of orange flagging/fencing or similar (typically 150 feet for songbirds, and 500 feet for raptors, or as directed by a qualified biologist) would be installed and maintained until nesting activity has ended, as determined in coordination with the qualified biologist and regulatory agencies, as appropriate.  

To mitigate construction impacts on special-status bat species, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures:  
- Where feasible, tree removal would be conducted in October, which is outside of the maternal and non-active seasons for bats.  
- During the summer months (June to August) in the year prior to construction, a thorough bat roosting habitat assessment would be conducted of all trees and structures within 100 feet of the construction | Less Than Significant |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual and acoustic surveys</td>
<td>area. Visual and acoustic surveys would be conducted for at least two nights during appropriate weather conditions to assess the presence of roosting bats. If presence is detected, a count and species analysis would be completed to help assess the type of colony and usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fewer than 30 days prior</td>
<td>• No fewer than 30 days prior to construction, and during the non-breeding and active season (typically October), bats would be safely evicted from any roosts to be directly impacted by the Project under the direction of a qualified biologist. Once bats have been safely evicted, exclusionary devices designed by the qualified biologist would be installed to prevent bats from returning and roosting in these areas prior to removal. Roosts not directly impacted by the Project would be left undisturbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and during the non-breeding</td>
<td>• No fewer than two weeks prior to construction, all excluded areas would be surveyed to determine whether exclusion measures were successful and to identify any outstanding concerns. Exclusionary measures would be monitored throughout construction to ensure they are functioning correctly and would be removed following construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and active season (typically</td>
<td>• If the presence or absence of bats cannot be confirmed in potential roosting habitat, a qualified biologist would be onsite during removal or disturbance of this area. If the biologist determines that bats are being disturbed during this work, work would be suspended until bats have left the vicinity on their own or can be safely excluded under direction of the biologist. Work would resume only once all bats have left the site and/or approval is given by a qualified biologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October), bats would be</td>
<td>• In the event that a maternal colony of bats is found, no work would be conducted within 100 feet of the maternal roosting site until the maternal season is finished or the bats have left the site, or as otherwise directed by a qualified biologist. The site would be designated as a sensitive area and protected as such until the bats have left the site. No activities would be authorized adjacent to the roosting site. Combustion equipment, such as generators, pumps, and vehicles, would not to be parked nor operated under or adjacent to the roosting site. Construction personnel would not be authorized to enter areas beneath the colony, especially during the evening exodus (typically between 15 minutes prior to sunset and one hour following sunset).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safely evicted from any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project and Route Option E2 would result in removal of historic streetlights in along Central Avenue and Broadway in Glendale, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>CUL-1</strong>: A qualified architectural historian (individual who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in Appendix A of 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61) shall review all project design documents related to historic streetlights and station platforms located immediately adjacent (i.e., on or directly in front of) known or potential historical resources identified in the Historical Resources Project Area to determine consistency with the rehabilitation treatment under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to confirm the Proposed Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The results of this review shall be provided to Metro in a memorandum prepared by the qualified architectural historian conducting the review, and Metro shall incorporate any design recommendations that would address potential substantial adverse changes in the significance of a historical resource into project design documents prior to the preparation of final construction documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground disturbing activities during construction of the Proposed Project or Route Options A2, E2, F1, G2, and H2 has the potential to encounter previously undiscovered and undocumented archaeological resources, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>CUL-2</strong>: A Qualified Archeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for professional archaeology, shall be retained for the Project and will remain on call during all ground-disturbing activities. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that Worker Environmental Awareness Protection (WEAP) training, presented by a Qualified Archaeologist and Native American representative, is provided to all construction and managerial personnel involved with the Proposed Project. The WEAP training shall provide an overview of cultural (prehistoric and historic) and tribal cultural resources and outline regulatory requirements for the protection of cultural resources. The WEAP shall also cover the proper procedures in the event of an unanticipated cultural resource. The WEAP training can be in the form of a video or PowerPoint presentation. Printed literature (handouts) can accompany the training and can also be given to new workers and contractors to avoid the necessity of continuous training over the course of the Proposed Project. If an inadvertent discovery of archaeological materials is made during construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and the Qualified Archaeologist shall be notified regarding the discovery. If prehistoric or potential tribal cultural resources are identified, the interested Native American participant(s) shall be notified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The archaeologist, in consultation with Native American participant(s) and the lead agency, shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is an historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, a unique paleontological resource, or tribal cultural resources). If avoidance is not feasible, a Qualified Archaeologist, in consultation with the lead agency, shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of, but would not be limited to, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The treatment plan shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and State repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

The Proposed Project and all Route Options pose risks of loss, injury, or death related to seismic conditions including ground shaking, liquefaction, slope failure and landslide, a potentially significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impact After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1: The Proposed Project shall be designed based on the latest versions of local and State building codes and regulations in order to construct seismically-resistant structures that help counteract the adverse effects of ground shaking. During final design, site-specific geotechnical investigations shall be performed at the sites where structures are proposed within liquefaction-prone designated areas. The investigations shall include exploratory soil borings with groundwater measurements. The exploratory soil borings shall be advanced, as a minimum, to the depths required by local and State jurisdictions to conduct liquefaction analyses. Similarly, the investigations shall include earthquake-induced settlement analyses of the dry substrata (i.e., above the groundwater table). The investigations shall also include seismic risk solutions to be incorporated into final design (e.g., deep foundations, ground improvement, remove and replace, among others) for those areas where liquefaction potential may be experienced. The investigation shall include stability analyses of slopes located within earthquake-induced landslides areas and provide appropriate slope stabilization measures (e.g., retaining walls, slopes with shotcrete faces, slopes re-grading, among others). The geotechnical investigations and design solutions shall follow the “Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California” Special Publication 117A of the California Geologic Service, as well as Metro’s Design Criteria and the latest federal and State seismic and environmental requirements.</td>
<td><strong>Less Than Significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction of the Proposed Project or Route Options A2, E2, F1, G2, and H2 has the potential to generate noise that could increase ambient noise levels by 5 dBA Leq or more which would exceed local significance thresholds within one or more jurisdictions along the BRT alignment, a potentially significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impact After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>NOI-1: Where construction cannot be performed in accordance with the FTA 1-hour Leq construction noise standards, elevates existing ambient noise levels by 5 dBA Leq or more, or exceeds other applicable noise thresholds of significance, The construction contractor shall develop a Noise Control Plan demonstrating how noise criteria would be achieved during construction. The Noise Control Plan shall be designed to follow Metro requirements, include construction noise control measures, measurements of existing noise, a list of the major pieces of construction equipment that would be used, and predictions of the noise levels at the closest noise-sensitive receivers (residences, hotels, schools, churches, temples, and similar facilities). The Noise Control Plan shall be approved by Metro prior to initiating localized construction activities. The Noise Control Plan shall require weekly noise monitoring at land used adjacent to construction activities. Noise reducing measures shall be required should the following performance standards be exceeded within the following jurisdictions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Los Angeles: Construction noise levels that exceed the existing ambient exterior noise level at a noise sensitive use by 10 dBA Leq within one hour for construction lasting more than one day, 5 dBA Leq for construction lasting more than 10 days in a three-month period, and any exceedance of 5 dBA during the hours of 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday and between 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. on Saturday or any time Sunday.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Burbank: Construction noise levels that exceed the existing ambient exterior noise level between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. at a noise sensitive use by 5 dBA Leq for construction lasting more than 10 days in a three-month period. Construction noise levels of any duration that exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA Leq at a noise sensitive use between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, or at any time on Sunday.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Glendale: Construction noise levels that exceed the existing ambient exterior noise level between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. at a noise sensitive use by 5 dBA Leq for construction lasting more than 10 days in a three-month period. Construction noise levels of any duration that exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA Leq at a noise sensitive use between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Saturday or at any time on Sunday.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potentially Significant Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - City of Pasadena: Construction noise levels that exceed 85 dBA Leq at 100 feet of distance or any duration of noise levels that exceeds existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA Leq at a noise sensitive use between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, or at any time on Sunday. Noise-reducing methods that may be implemented include:  
  - Where construction occurs near noise sensitive land uses, specialty equipment with enclosed engines, acoustically attenuating shields, and/or high-performance mufflers shall be used.  
  - Limit unnecessary idling of equipment.  
  - Install temporary noise barriers or noise-control curtains, where feasible and desirable.  
  - Reroute construction-related truck traffic away from local residential streets and/or sensitive receivers.  
  - Use electric instead of diesel-powered equipment and hydraulic instead of pneumatic tools where feasible. |
| - Construction of the Proposed Project or Route Options A2, E2, F1, G2, and H2 includes use of heavy equipment that could produce vibration that would exceed the FTA’s recommended limit of 0.2 in/sec PPV for any non-engineered timber and masonry buildings within 25 feet of construction activity, a potentially significant impact. NOI-2: Where equipment such as a vibratory roller, that produces high levels of vibration is used within 25 feet of buildings or typical equipment such as large bulldozer is used within 15 feet of buildings, the 0.2 PPV inches per second vibration damage risk threshold would be exceeded. The Construction Vibration Control Plan shall include mitigation measures to minimize vibration impacts during construction. Recommended construction vibration mitigation measures shall, at a minimum, include:  
  - The contractor shall minimize the use of tracked vehicles.  
  - The contractor shall avoid vibratory compaction within 25 feet of buildings.  
  - The contractor shall monitor vibration levels near sensitive receivers during activities that generate high vibration levels to ensure thresholds are not exceeded. |
### Potentially Significant Impact

| Construction of the Proposed Project or Route Options A2, E2, F1, G2, and H2 could produce vibration from bulldozers and similar equipment that could annoy those in institutional uses (e.g., schools, churches) during the day, and residents at any time during the day or evening. Equipment such as large bulldozers could generate 87 VdB of vibration at 25 feet, which would exceed the 75 VdB significance threshold for occasional events impacting residences and the 78 VdB threshold for institutional daytime land uses, a potentially significant impact. |
|---|---|---|
| **NOI-3:** Where equipment such as a vibratory roller that produces high levels of vibration is used within 105 feet of residences or institutional daytime land uses or equipment such as large bulldozers are used within 65 feet of such uses, the 75 VdB vibration threshold for human annoyance could be exceeded at residences of the 75 VdB threshold at institutional uses. The Construction Vibration Control Plan shall include mitigation measures to minimize vibration impacts during construction. Recommended construction vibration mitigation measures that shall be considered and implemented where feasible include: |
| • The contractor shall minimize the use of tracked vehicles and vibratory equipment. |
| • The contractor shall avoid vibratory compaction. |
| • The contractor shall monitor vibration levels near sensitive receivers during activities that generate high vibration levels to ensure thresholds are not exceeded. |
| **Impact After Mitigation** |
| Less Than Significant |

### TRANSPORTATION

<p>| Construction of the Proposed Project and all Route Options may result in temporary relocation of existing bus stops and temporary delays to transit travel time due to lane closures, a potentially significant impact. |
|---|---|---|
| <strong>TRA-1:</strong> Prior to the initiation of localized construction activities, a Traffic Management Plan compliant with the provisions of the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Traffic Control Handbook and local ordinances, as applicable, shall be developed by Metro and the construction contractor in coordination with the City of Los Angeles, City of Burbank, City of Glendale, and City of Pasadena. Metro shall develop detours as appropriate and communicate any changes to bus service to local transit agencies in advance. Stops shall be relocated in a manner which is least disruptive to transit. If bus stops need to be relocated, warning signs shall be posted in advance of closure along with alternative stop notifications and information regarding the duration of the closure. |
| <strong>Impact After Mitigation</strong> |
| Less Than Significant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impact After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the Proposed Project and all Route Options may result in traffic delays and inconvenience due to temporary lane closures temporary, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>TRA-2</strong>: Prior to the initiation of localized construction activities, a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan compliant with the provisions of the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Traffic Control Handbook and local ordinances, as applicable, shall be developed by Metro and the construction contractor in coordination with the City of Los Angeles, City of Burbank, City of Glendale, and City of Pasadena. The Traffic and/or Construction Management Plan shall include provisions such as: approval of work hours and lane closures, designation of construction lay-down zones, provisions to maintain roadway access to adjoining land uses, use of warning signs, temporary traffic control devices and/or flagging to manage traffic conflicts, and designation of detour routes where appropriate.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the Proposed Project and all Route Options may require temporary closure of sidewalks affecting pedestrian circulation, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>TRA-3</strong>: Prior to the initiation of localized construction activities, a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan compliant with the provisions of the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Traffic Control Handbook and local ordinances, as applicable, shall be developed by Metro and the construction contractor, in coordination with affected jurisdictions. The plan shall include provisions for wayfinding signage, lighting, and access to pedestrian safety amenities (such as handrails, fences and alternative walkways). Metro shall also work with local municipalities and public works departments to confirm that only one side of the street would be closed at a time. If crosswalks are temporarily closed, pedestrians shall be directed to use nearby pedestrian facilities. Where construction encroaches on sidewalks, walkways and crosswalks, special pedestrian safety measures shall be used such as detour routes and temporary pedestrian shelters. Access to businesses and residences shall be maintained throughout the construction period. These mitigation measures shall be documented in a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Impact After Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the Proposed Project and Route Options E2 and F1 would result in temporary</td>
<td><strong>TRA-4:</strong> Prior to the initiation of localized construction activities, a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan compliant with the provisions of the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Traffic Control Handbook and local ordinances, as applicable, shall be developed by Metro and the construction contractor, in coordination with the affected jurisdictions. The plan shall identify on-street bicycle detour routes and signage. Metro shall also work with local municipalities and public works departments to accommodate bicycle circulation during construction. Bicycle access to businesses and residences shall be maintained throughout the construction period. These mitigation measures shall be documented in a Traffic Management Plan and/or Construction Management Plan.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roadway lane closures which may affect existing and planned bicycle facilities, a potentially significant impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Project would result in the permanent conversion of the existing 10-foot buffered Class II bicycle lanes along Colorado Boulevard to a 12-foot shared bus/bicycle lane which would be inconsistent with the City of Los Angeles Mobility Element 2035, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>TRA-5:</strong> Prior to completion of Final Design, Metro shall convene a design working group with LADOT to resolve potential bicycle conflicts and identify network enhancements that integrate bicycle and BRT facilities, consistent with Policy 2.6 and Policy 2.9 of the Mobility Plan 2035. The design working group shall include representatives from the LADOT Active Transportation Division, the Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, and a representative of the Los Angeles Bicycle Coalition. Coordination shall be provided with LADOT and the Active Transportation Division during the preliminary engineering design development phase.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the Proposed Project and all Route Options would result in lane closures, traffic detours, and designated truck routes associated with construction could temporarily result in decreased access and delayed response times for emergency services, a potentially significant impact.</td>
<td><strong>TRA-6:</strong> The construction contractor shall provide early notification of traffic disruption to emergency service providers. Work plans and traffic control measures shall be coordinated with emergency responders to prevent impacts to emergency response times. A Traffic Management Plan compliant with the provisions of the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the California Traffic Control Handbook and local ordinances, as applicable, shall be developed and implemented to minimize impacts on emergency access.</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Potentially Significant Impact** | **Mitigation Measures** | **Impact After Mitigation**
---|---|---
**TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

| CUL-2: | A Qualified Archeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for professional archeology, shall be retained for the Project and will remain on call during all ground-disturbing activities. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that Worker Environmental Awareness Protection (WEAP) training, presented by a Qualified Archaeologist and Native American representative, is provided to all construction and managerial personnel involved with the Proposed Project. The WEAP training shall provide an overview of cultural (prehistoric and historic) and tribal cultural resources and outline regulatory requirements for the protection of cultural resources. The WEAP shall also cover the proper procedures in the event of an unanticipated cultural resource. The WEAP training can be in the form of a video or PowerPoint presentation. Printed literature (handouts) can accompany the training and can also be given to new workers and contractors to avoid the necessity of continuous training over the course of the Proposed Project. If an inadvertent discovery of archaeological materials is made during construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and the Qualified Archaeologist shall be notified regarding the discovery. If prehistoric or potential tribal cultural resources are identified, the interested Native American participant(s) shall be notified. The archaeologist, in consultation with Native American participant(s) and the lead agency, shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is an historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, a unique paleontological resource, or tribal cultural resources). If avoidance is not feasible, a Qualified Archaeologist, in consultation with the lead agency, shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of, but would not be limited to, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The treatment plan shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and State repositories, libraries, and interested professionals. | Less Than Significant |

Ground disturbing activities during construction of the Proposed Project or Route Options A2, E2, F1, G2, and H2 has the potential to impact previously undiscovered buried tribal cultural resources of historical significance, a potentially significant impact.

ES.17 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires an analysis of alternatives to the Proposed Project to reduce or eliminate significant impacts associated with project development. In addition to the route options, two alternatives have been identified to the Proposed Project. Alternative 1 is the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative is required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2) and assumes that the Proposed Project would not be implemented by Metro. The No Project Alternative allows decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the Proposed Project. The No Project Alternative is evaluated in the context of the existing transportation facilities in the Project Area and other capital transportation improvements and/or transit and highway operational enhancements that are reasonably foreseeable.

Alternative 2 would implement improved bus service instead of BRT. The improved bus service would have some BRT characteristics. The service may be as frequent as that proposed for BRT, though its ability to attract as much ridership may be less due to less travel time savings and amenities, meaning a slightly less frequent service would be operated compared to that proposed for the BRT Project. Buses would operate in mixed-flow traffic with Traffic Signal Priority (TSP). Stops would be more frequent than the BRT line, but less frequent than local bus lines (typically every 0.6 miles on average). Travel times would be faster than for local service but slower than the travel times expected from the BRT Project. Stops would occur at existing bus stations and there would be no modifications to the roadway configuration. Physical improvements would be limited to new signs at bus stops as well a shelter with solar lighting, bench and trash receptacle as a minimum level of bus stop amenity. Alternative 2 would not include curb extensions, elimination of parking, or changes to bicycle lanes. This alternative would not require a Maintenance and Storage Facility, as buses would be maintained at existing Metro facilities. Similar to BRT buses, buses would have low-floor design to allow for faster and easier boarding and alighting. The fleet would be equipped for all door boarding.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected among the alternatives that are evaluated in the Draft EIR. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts. A summary of the impacts of the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) and Alternative 2 relative to the Proposed Project and the Route Options is shown Table ES-5. The No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative because there would be no physical changes to the existing environment resulting in construction or operational impacts. Other transit projects would be constructed to enhance the regional network, although improvements within the Project corridor would be limited and minor related to increased ridership. The No Project Alternative would include the North San Fernando Valley (SFV) BRT Project and the NextGen Bus Plan, in addition to other transportation and land use projects listed in Chapter 5 Cumulative Impact Analysis. The North SFV BRT Improvements Project would provide a new, high-quality bus service between the communities of Chatsworth to the west and North Hollywood to the east. Not constructing and operating the Proposed Project would eliminate the potentially significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project.
related to transportation (construction), aesthetics (operations), biological resources (construction), cultural resources (construction and operations), geology and soils (operations), noise (construction), and tribal cultural resources (construction). However, the regional transit network within the Project corridor would not be substantially enhanced by the other transit projects.

If the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior, CEQA requires selection of the environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative from among the Proposed Project and the other alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative because, as compared to the Proposed Project and Route Options, it avoids or reduces all construction impacts related to transportation, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources. It also avoids or reduces operational impacts related to transportation, aesthetics, cultural resources, and geology and soils.
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Kimley-Horn
DATE: November 19, 2020

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Marisa Creter, Executive Director

RE: METRO MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRITERIA AND MEASURE M GUIDELINES

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Discuss and provide direction to staff.

BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Board of Directors recently directed Metro staff to circulate recommendations to modernize the Metro Highway Program, including broadening its mission, expanding funding eligibility, recommitting to the previously adopted Metro Complete Streets Policy, and updating performance metrics. As a result, Metro staff are requesting councils of governments and regional partners to review and provide feedback on the Measure R Highway Program Criteria and Measure M Guidelines, which can be found in Attachments A and B, by Monday, December 7, 2020. The attachments also include “redline” versions of Metro’s proposed changes, in which highlighted (yellow) sections indicate languages that are being removed and red sections indicate languages that are being added.

Metro staff will also solicit input and feedback from the Metro Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Advisory Committee over the next few weeks. At the conclusion of the comment period, Metro staff will summarize stakeholder input and proceed with a formal Criteria/Guideline Amendment for final Metro Board consideration.

Upon reviewing the proposed changes, SGVCOG staff believes that there would be no impact on SGVCOG’s Measure R funding given that all of the Measure R funds were allocated towards projects and not programs. A list of the SGVCOG’s Measure R projects can be found below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2</td>
<td>$1.27 Billion</td>
<td>MIS/EIR/EIS/EA Draft Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Line Foothill Extension</td>
<td>$735 Million</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connector: Transit Corridor</td>
<td>$160 Million</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-710 Project Gap Closure</td>
<td>$780 Million</td>
<td>MIS/EIR/EIS/EA Draft Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II</td>
<td>$400 Million</td>
<td>Final Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, SGVCOG staff is concerned that the proposed changes will create overlapping subregional fund definitions particularly in the Measure M programs. The SGVCOG, under Measure M, established the Active Transportation, First and Last Mile/Complete Streets, Bus
System Improvements, and Highway Demand subregional programs to address the work items Metro is attempting to add to the Highway Efficiency Program. The table below showcases the total amount of funds by program for the SGVCOG’s Measure M MSP Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Amount of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program (Including Greenway Project)</td>
<td>$231,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus System Improvement Program</td>
<td>$55,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First/Last Mile and Complete Streets</td>
<td>$198,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Demand Based Program (HOV Ext. &amp; Connectivity)</td>
<td>$231,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Movement (Improvements &amp; Railroad Xing Elim.)</td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Efficiency Program</td>
<td>$534,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS/Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)</td>
<td>$66,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This change can possibly create a confusing overlap of eligibility and undermines the premise for the original funding split between these programs. SGVCOG staff invested a tremendous amount of staff time to coordinate with member agencies and their elected officials to obtain consensus on the funding splits between these programs and the specific projects of interest. SGVCOG staff is concerned that Metro’s recommendations would alter the program definitions that could open the door on those funding allocation agreements.

While SGVCOG staff understands that there has been pressure for certain subregions that did not divide their funding as the SGVCOG did to support projects such as bike routes, pedestrian improvements, and complete streets and that Metro staff’s proposed amendments can address the specific issues, SGVCOG staff is concerned that such a change can undermine San Gabriel Valley cities’ previous work.

This item was previously presented to the SGVCOG Public Works Technical Advisory Committee for discussion on Monday, November 9, 2020 and the committee recommended SGVCOG staff to submit a comment letter expressing that Metro should allow individual subregions to modify their eligibility requirements to preserve the existing funding structure that was established by the SGVCOG for the San Gabriel Valley subregion.

SGVCOG Chief Engineer, Mark Christoffels, will provide a detailed presentation on this item and solicit feedback from committee members.

Prepared by: ____________________________
Alexander P. Fung
Management Analyst

Approved by: ____________________________
Marisa Creter
Executive Director
ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A – Metro’s Recommended Revisions to Measure R Highway Program Criteria
Attachment B – Metro’s Recommended Revisions to Measure M Guidelines, Section X Multi-Year Programs (Highway Subfunds)
RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRITERIA

The following shall replace Measure R Highway Program eligibility criteria in their entirety:

Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp/Interchange Improvements

The intent of a Measure R Highway Operational Improvement is to improve multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability along an existing State Highway corridor by reducing congestion and operational deficiencies that do not significantly expand the motor vehicle capacity of the system, or by incorporating complete streets infrastructure into the corridor, in accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. In addition to those eligible projects on the State Highway System, for Measure R, projects located on primary roadways, including principal arterials, minor arterials, and key collector roadways, will be considered eligible for Operational Improvements and for ramp and interchange improvements.

Examples of eligible improvement projects include:
- interchange modifications;
- ramp modifications;
- auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges;
- curve corrections/improve alignment;
- signals and/or intersection improvements;
- two-way left-turn lanes;
- intersection and street widening
- traffic signal upgrade/timing/synchronization, including all supporting infrastructure;
- traffic surveillance;
- channelization;
- Park and Ride facilities;
- turnouts;
- shoulder widening/improvement;
- safety improvements;
- on-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements;
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways;
- sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps;
- pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks;
transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies.

Up to 20% of a subregion’s Operational Improvement dollars may be used for soundwalls. Landscaping installed as a component of an operational improvement must be limited to no more than 20% of a project’s budget. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to State Highway Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.
The following shall replace Measure R Highway Program eligibility criteria in their entirety:

**Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp/Interchange Improvements**

The intent of a Measure R Highway Operational Improvement is to improve traffic flow in multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability along an existing State Highway corridor by reducing congestion and operational deficiencies at spot locations that do not significantly expand the design capacity of the system and are intended to address recurrent congestion motor vehicle capacity of the system, or by incorporating complete streets infrastructure into the corridor, in accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. In addition to those eligible projects on the State Highway System, for Measure R, projects located on primary roadways located generally within a one mile corridor of any State Highway, including principal arterials, minor arterials, and key collector roadways, will be considered eligible for Operational Improvements and for ramp and interchange improvements.

Examples of eligible improvement projects include:

- interchange modifications (but not to accommodate traffic volumes that are significantly larger than the existing facilities were designed for);
- ramp modifications (acceleration – deceleration/weaving);
- auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges;
- curve corrections/improve alignment;
- signals and/or intersection improvements;
- two-way left-turn lanes;
- intersection and street widening
- traffic signal upgrade/timing/synchronization;
- traffic surveillance;
- channelization;
- Park and Ride facilities;
- turnouts;
- shoulder widening/ improvement;
- safety improvements that reduce incident delay;
- on-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements;
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways;
- sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps;
- pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks.
- Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies

Up to 20% of the Arroyo Verdugo, Las Virgenes/Malibu and South Bay Subregion’s Operational Improvement dollars may be used for soundwalls and bike lanes. Landscaping installed as a component of an operational improvement must be limited to no more than 20% of a project's budget. State of good repair, maintenance and/or beautification projects are not eligible. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to State Highway Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.
ATTACHMENT B

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE M GUIDELINES, SECTION X MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMS (HIGHWAY SUBFUNDS)

The following shall replace subsection 'A. "Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements" definition.' in its entirety.

Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, travel times; and reduce recurring congestion, high-frequency traffic incident locations, and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements which achieve these same objectives are eligible on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related project phases as referenced in Sections IX and X and are subject to eligibility criteria and phasing thresholds that will be developed within 6 months as part of the applicable administrative procedures. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- System and local interchange modifications
- Ramp modifications/improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Alignment/geometric design improvements
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials
- Intersection and street widening/improvements
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing, signal synchronization, and all supporting infrastructure
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Shoulder widening/improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Safety improvements
- Freeway bypass/freeway to freeway connections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- ExpressLanes
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies

*The following shall replace subsection ‘C. “Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition’ in its entirety.*

**“Multi-modal Connectivity” definition:**

Multi-modal connectivity projects include those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and network performance; provide network connections; reduce congestion, queuing or user conflicts; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; encourage ridesharing; and reduce vehicle miles traveled. Project should encourage and provide multi-modal access based on existing demand and/or planned need and observed safety incidents or conflicts. Subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:
- Transportation Center expansions
- Park and Ride expansions
- Multi-modal access improvements
- New mode and access accommodations
- First/last mile infrastructure

*The following shall replace subsection ‘D. “Freeway Interchange Improvement” definition’ in its entirety.*

**“Freeway Interchange Improvements” definition:**

Freeway Interchange Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance safety by reducing conflicts; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways which achieve these same objectives are also eligible under this category. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic
Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

The following shall replace subsection ‘E. “Arterial Street Improvements” definition,’ in its entirety.

“Arterial Street Improvements” definition:

Arterial Street improvements include those projects, which upon implementation would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies. Projects must have a nexus to a principal arterial, minor arterial or key collector roadway. The context and function of the roadway should be considered (i.e., serves major activity center(s), accommodates trips entering/exiting the jurisdiction or subregion, serves intra-area travel) and adopted in the City’s general plan. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Intersection or street widening
- Two-way left-turn or right turn lanes
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing
- Sight distance corrections/improve alignment
- Turnouts
- Safety improvements
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a street right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies
The following shall replace subsection ‘A. “Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements” definition:’ in its entirety.

Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; enhance safety by reducing conflicts; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, travel times; and reduce recurring congestion, high-frequency traffic incident locations and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements which achieve these same objectives are eligible on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways within one mile of a State Highway; or farther than one mile as determined on a case by case basis. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related project phases as referenced in Sections IX and X, and are subject to eligibility criteria and phasing thresholds that will be developed within 6 months as part of the applicable administrative procedures. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicles Miles Traveled.

Examples of Eligible Projects:
- System and local interchange modifications
- Ramp modifications/improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Alignment/geometric design improvements
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials
- Intersection and street widening/improvements on a State Conventional Highway or within one mile of a state highway, or on a major/minor arterial on a case by case basis
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing, signal synchronization and all supporting infrastructure
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Shoulder widening/improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Safety improvements that reduce incident delay
- Freeway bypass/freeway to freeway connections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- ExpressLanes
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies

The following shall replace subsection 'C. “Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:

Multi-modal connectivity projects include those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and network performance; provide network connections; reduce congestion, queuing or user conflicts and encourage ridesharing; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; and encourage ridesharing. Project should encourage and provide multi-modal access based on existing demand and/or planned need and observed safety incidents or conflicts. Subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Transportation Center expansions
- Park and Ride expansions
- Multi-modal access improvements
- New mode and access accommodations
- First/last mile infrastructure

The following shall replace subsection ‘D. “Freeway Interchange Improvement” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Freeway Interchange Improvements” definition:

Freeway Interchange Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance safety by reducing conflicts; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways which achieve these same objectives within one mile of the State Highway, are also eligible under this category. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic
Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

The following shall replace subsection ‘E. “Arterial Street Improvements” definition: ’ in its entirety.

“Arterial Street Improvements” definition:

Arterial Street improvements include those projects, which upon implementation would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; enhance safety by reducing conflicts, improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies. Projects must have a nexus to a principal arterial, minor arterial or key collector roadway. The context and function of the roadway should be considered (i.e., serves major activity center(s), accommodates trips entering exiting the jurisdiction, serves intra-area travel) and adopted in the City’s general plan. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Intersection or street widening
- Two-way left-turn or right turn lanes
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing
- Sight distance corrections/improve alignment
- Turnouts
- Safety improvements that reduce incident delay
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies
To: San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Transportation Committee  
Date: November 9, 2020  
Re: November 2020 Foothill Transit Liaison Report

Safety remains Foothill Transit’s top priority. All public health safety and social distancing practices continue to be in effect in buses and at bus stops. We continue to monitor the developments surrounding COVID-19 and work in partnership with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health to respond quickly according to public health guidelines. Riders continue to be asked to wash hands before each trip, wear a face covering, physically distance from others, follow safety messages posted on board, and be kind. Foothill Transit’s COVID-19 response information is available at foothilltransit.org/covid.

**New Union Station Patsaouras Bus Plaza Station:**
Effective November 1, the busway at Alameda Street has been relocated to the new Union Station Patsaouras Bus Plaza Station adjacent to Patsaouras Plaza, in the median of the busway next to US-101. The station makes it safe and easy for riders to make transit connections at Union Station, and features a new pedestrian bridge walkway between the new station and the Patsaouras Transit Plaza. The Silver Streak and all Commuter Express Lines 490, 493, 495, 498, 499, and 699 are now serving the Union Station Patsaouras Bus Plaza Station.

**Schedule Change Feedback Solicited:**
Following the implementation of the October 18 service change, Foothill Transit is soliciting feedback from the community. While virtual sessions on November 10 and 11 will have been conducted by the publication date of this report, the public is encouraged to submit further feedback at changes@foothilltransit.org or 1-800-RIDE-INFO. Further information is available at foothilltransit.org/meettheplanner.

**Regional Contactless Mobile Fare Payment Option:**
A new regional mobile fare payment option accepted by all 26 TAP-enabled agencies is now available via Apple Wallet and the TAP LA app. This touchless fare payment system allows a customer’s iPhone or Apple Watch to be used on bus fareboxes and rail stations as their Regular or Reduced Fare TAP card, and helps minimize customer contact on public transit. More detailed information is available at the TAP website.

**Transit Store Operations:**
The West Covina, El Monte, and Puente Hills Mill Transit Stores are now open to walk-in customers. The Transit Stores are following guidelines developed by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, and the number of people allowed inside at a time are being monitored and limited to maintain safety. Customer service staff continue to be available at 1-800-RIDE-INFO, and customers are encouraged to call for all transit-related related needs.