

### 3.16.1 Introduction

This section describes the geographic and regulatory setting for transportation, discusses the construction and operations impacts of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* and its elements, and determines the significance of impacts. Where needed, this section identifies mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid any significant impacts, when feasible.

The Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Report prepared for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* documents the assumptions, methodologies, and findings of the potential transportation impacts of the proposed Project and is the basis for the evaluation of impacts in this section (Appendix I). Preparation of trip generation estimates and distribution of trips for individual project elements and intersection operational analysis was not included in the TIA because specific design and locations are not known at this time. In response to Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has developed new Transportation Impact Guidelines (hereafter “Guidelines”) that include a comprehensive systematic approach to the assessment of transportation impacts. Part of the Guidelines, the County’s screening criteria were used to identify those typical elements/design components under the six kit of parts (KOP) categories, which, when implemented as part of a subsequent project, would be subject to subsequent vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis. Section 3.16.3.3, *Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, below describes the overall methods and criteria used in assessing the proposed Project’s impacts.

The analysis in this section includes impact determinations under CEQA for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* that are applicable to all 18 jurisdictions in the study area, including the County and non-County jurisdictions (17 cities). Except for significant and unavoidable impacts, all identified significant environmental effects of the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan* can be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in this PEIR are implemented. These mitigation measures will be implemented for subsequent projects that are carried out by the County. Because some later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County, the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the mitigation measures would be incorporated. Therefore, where this PEIR concludes a less-than-significant impact for later activities carried out by the County, the impact would be significant and unavoidable when these activities are not carried out by the County.

## 3.16.2 Setting

### 3.16.2.1 Geographic

#### Regional Setting

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* study area is located within a 2-mile-wide, 51-mile-long corridor of the LA River that stretches across the San Fernando Valley in the west, from the San Gabriel

Mountains and Angeles National Forest in the northeast, and south through Central Los Angeles down to Long Beach and the Pacific Ocean. This area includes much of urbanized South Los Angeles County, but excludes West Los Angeles and the coastal cities in the South Bay area of the County. The transportation system serving this area is a complex, built-out, multimodal network designed to carry both people and goods. It consists of major freeways, roadways, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, public transit, freight railways, airports, seaports, and intermodal terminals. There is also a network of trails through the extensive open areas and mountains that lie between the urbanized areas. Major components of the transportation network within the study area are described below. Table 3.16-1 presents a comparison of existing transportation facilities and amenities by river frame.

**Table 3.16-1. Existing Transportation Amenities by Frame**

River Frame		Bicycle Facilities (Miles) Existing/Proposed				Trails Length (Miles)		Trail Access Points	Transit Routes Counts	Park % Land Area <sup>1</sup>
		Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Existing	Proposed			
1	Estuary	8.2	1.7	8.2	2.2	4.0	0.0	8	40	2%
		1.8	8.5	2.1	0.2					
2	South Plain	6.0	5.6	0.7	0.0	4.4	0.0	5	16	2%
		1.1	15.5	2.7	0.0					
3	Central Plain	8.2	0.7	1.1	0.0	5.6	4.0	15	18	5%
		9.5	23.9	23.2	0.0					
4	North Plain	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	5	18	1%
		7.7	7.2	5.8	0.0					
5	Heights	0.1	12.8	10.3	0.0	1.1	5.0	2	81	1%
		9.6	19.8	18.9	18.1					
6	Narrows	14.1	17.5	15.8	0.0	5.4	4.5	31	28	37%
		12.3	19.6	22.1	7.1					
7	East Valley	0.3	13.1	1.4	0.0	1.0	0.0	0	18	7%
		7.8	8.5	10.2	6.2					
8	Mid Valley	1.3	13.9	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	16	27	5%
		7.1	13.2	15.3	1.8					
9	West Valley	34.3	11.4	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	15	31	20%
		7.1	8.6	30.0	10.4					
<b>Total</b>		<b>75.1</b>	<b>76.7</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>97.0</b>	<b>277.0</b>	<b>9%</b>
		<b>64.0</b>	<b>124.8</b>	<b>130.4</b>	<b>43.8</b>					

<sup>1</sup> Percentage of land area dedicated to parks.

### Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities

Figures 3.16-1 through 3.16-3 present the existing and proposed bicycle facilities within the study area. Proposed facilities include all known facilities proposed by any jurisdiction within the study area. As shown in Table 3.16-1, there are almost 195 miles of existing bicycle facilities within the study area, including just over 75 miles of Class I bicycle paths that run primarily along the LA River,

almost 77 miles of Class II bicycle lanes, 40 miles of Class III sharrowed<sup>1</sup> or signed bicycle facilities, and just over 2 miles of Class IV bicycle tracks. Class II bicycle lanes represent a plurality of the bicycle facility typologies within the study area despite the presence of bicycle paths along both sides of the river in many locations. Class I bikeways are defined as off-street bicycle paths, Class II bikeways are defined as striped lanes within streets, Class III bikeways are defined as signed or sharrowed bicycle routes, and Class IV bikeways are defined as bicycle facilities on roadways that provide a physical vertical barrier between bicyclists and vehicular traffic.

The bicycle network within the study area is not fully built out. Almost 365 miles of the planned bikeways in the study area are yet to be built, almost double the number of miles already on the ground. Of the planned miles of bicycle facilities, Class III sharrowed facilities represent a plurality (just over 130 miles), with Class II bicycle lanes representing an almost equal share (just under 125 miles). There are almost 110 miles of planned Class I and Class IV facilities.

In addition to these dedicated bicycle facilities, numerous multi-modal bridges over the LA River for exclusive use of bicyclists and pedestrians (and sometimes also for equestrians) have recently or will soon open across the LA River, including the Riverwalk Bridge in Glendale, the Garden Bridge connecting to Zoo Drive, and the North Atwater La Kretz Bridge, the Sunnynook Bridge, the Red Car Bridge, and the Taylor Yard Bridge farther to the south. These bridges will cross the river and connect communities on the river's north or east side to existing segments of the LA River Bike Path.

### **Existing Public Transit Service and Freight Rail Service**

The regional public transit system includes heavy rail transit operations, regional commuter rail services, regional and municipal bus operations, and local shuttles. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is the largest provider of public transit service in the study area, and its service is supplemented by numerous municipal transit lines and local shuttle services.

Figures 3.16-4 through 3.16-6 present the existing transit routes within the study area. The study area is served by eight transit providers on 188 routes, including by Metro, DASH (Los Angeles Department of Transportation), Antelope Valley Transit Authority, Santa Clarita Transit, Big Blue Bus (Santa Monica), Foothill Transit, Torrance Transit, and Long Beach Transit. Metro rail and bus rapid transit service within the study area includes the A Line (formerly, the Blue Line) within the Long Beach area, the C Line (formerly, the Green Line) in South Los Angeles, and the G Line (formerly, the Orange Line) in the San Fernando Valley.

National and regional passenger rail service in the study area is operated by Amtrak and Metrolink. The two services, in some places, share use of tracks with the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), which operates a vast rail network that extends throughout the State and the nation. Planning is underway for development of a high-speed rail line that will link Southern California with Central California and the Bay Area, and portions of the alignments under study include segments that lie adjacent to the LA River.

---

<sup>1</sup>A sign showing a bicycle under two wide arrows that is painted on a road to show that people riding bicycles and those driving cars must share the road.

## Existing Streets and Freeways

Figures 3.16-7 through 3.16-9 present the existing roadway network within the study area, including freeways, arterials, secondary streets, and local roads. The network of freeways and State highways supports high-capacity limited-access travel, whereas the arterial network provides high levels of signalized street capacity and serves as a feeder system for the regional freeways and local street system. The freeway and highway system is the primary means of regional person and goods movement, providing for direct vehicular access to river access points, and to employment, services, and goods.

In many locations, arterial streets provide the only local access crossing points over the LA River, with many secondary and especially local roads dead-ending at the river's fence line.

Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles both have Vision Zero plans, which aim to reduce traffic fatalities and/or injuries to zero. Each agency has identified specific roadway corridors that experience higher than average collisions, injuries, and fatalities. Within the study area, Los Angeles County has identified Rosecrans Avenue and Compton Boulevard, both located in the East Rancho Dominguez unincorporated area and Santa Fe Avenue, located in the Rancho Dominguez unincorporated area (in Frame 3), as Collision Concentration Corridors. Similarly, the City of Los Angeles has identified the following streets within the study area as being part of a High Injury Network:

- East Olympic Boulevard
- South Alameda Street
- East 7<sup>th</sup> Street
- East 6<sup>th</sup> Street
- North Broadway
- North Figueroa Street
- San Fernando Road
- Cahuenga Boulevard
- Ventura Boulevard
- Riverside Drive
- Balboa Boulevard
- Victory Boulevard
- Reseda Boulevard
- Vanowen Street
- Tampa Boulevard
- De Soto Avenue
- Sherman Avenue
- Fallbrook Avenue

Major freeways serving the study area include Interstate (I-) 710, I-105, State Route (SR) 91, SR-1, SR-60, I-10, SR-2, SR-110, I-5, SR-2, SR-134, United States Route (US-) 101, SR-170, I-405, and SR-27. I-710 forms a spine along the river's southern reach in River Frames 1 through 4, while I-5 does the same in River Frame 6. US-101 runs east-west through much of the study area in Frames 6 through 9, but does not run as nearly parallel to or as close to the river as I-710 and I-5 do.

### **Existing River Access Points, Trails, and Park Lands**

Figures 3.16-10 through 3.16-12 present the existing river access points, existing and planned trails, and park lands within the study area. There are 97 existing river access points along the LA River, and more than 26 miles of existing trails within the study area with an additional almost 23 miles planned. Major existing trails in the study area include the LA River County River Bikepath in the Long Beach area in Frame 1, the LA River Trail and the LA River Trail Extension in South Los Angeles in Frames 2–4, the Arroyo Seco Trail north of Downtown Los Angeles in Frame 6, and the Rim of the Valley Trail, which runs through Griffith Park, also in Frame 6.

Almost 10 square miles, or approximately 9 percent of the study area, is existing park land. Frame 6, the Narrows, where the river bends around Griffith Park, and Frame 9, the West Valley, which includes Balboa Park, have the highest percentage of land area devoted to parks, at 37 percent and 20 percent, respectively.

### **Frame 1 through Frame 9**

To support context-sensitive planning that accounts for local needs, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* study area has been subdivided into nine distinct geographical sections or planning frames. Frames are numbered 1 through 9, beginning in Long Beach with Frame 1 and ending in Canoga Park with Frame 9. Some planning frames include just one jurisdiction, while others include multiple local jurisdictions. As shown above, the major components of the transportation network within the study area were presented in Figures 3.16-1 through 3.16-12, which also illustrated Frames 1 through 9 within their respective geographic context. Similarly, Table 3.16-1 presents a quantitative data comparison of transportation facilities and amenities by river frame.

## **3.16.2.2 Regulatory**

### **State**

#### **California Environmental Quality Act**

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a) establishes increases in VMT as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts, and states that other considerations may include effects on transit and non-motorized travel. VMT as a metric for impacts is consistent with a broad range of State legislation, regional and local programs, and plans and policies, and as such, the State CEQA Guidelines also require consideration of whether a project may conflict either directly or indirectly with plans, policies, programs, or ordinances addressing circulation, particularly related to increases in VMT and associated reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) generation. The State has set ambitious targets for reductions in GHG generation, which in turn relates to transportation and required reductions in VMT, as transportation is the largest generator of GHGs by sector in the State (41 percent). Thus, legislation, programs, plans, and policies that target GHG generation and climate

change relate directly to transportation and the need to reduce VMT. SB 743, which amended the State CEQA Guidelines with respect to VMT, is discussed in detail below.

### **Statewide Transportation Improvement Program**

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) administers transportation programming. Transportation programming is the public decision-making process that sets priorities and funds projects envisioned in long-range transportation plans. It commits expected revenues over a multi-year period to transportation projects. The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year Capital Improvement Program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the operation of State Highways, including the freeways passing through Los Angeles County.

### **Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006**

Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, recognizes that California is a major contributor to U.S. GHG emissions. AB 32 acknowledges that such emissions cause significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment, and therefore must be identified and mitigated where appropriate. AB 32 also establishes a State goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, a reduction of approximately 30 percent from projected State emission levels and 15 percent from current State levels, with even more substantial reductions required in the future. Pursuant to AB 32, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) must adopt regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. As the largest single sector of the economy that generates GHGs, changes in transportation are a focus of these efforts.

### **SB 32/Executive Order B-30-15**

This executive order sets in place a new statewide policy goal to reduce GHG emissions 40 percent below their 1990 levels by 2030. This order acts as an intermediate goal to achieving 80 percent reductions by 2050.

California is on track to meet or exceed the target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in AB 32. California's new emission reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 will make it possible to reach the goal established by Executive Order S-3-05 of reducing emissions 80 percent under 1990 levels by 2050. Such reductions will require major changes in the transportation sector. This intermediate target was codified into law by SB 32, which was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown on September 8, 2016.

### **SB 375**

The adoption of SB 375 on September 30, 2008, created a process whereby local governments and other stakeholders must work together within their region to achieve the GHG reductions specified in AB 32 through integrated development patterns, improved transportation planning, and other transportation measures and policies. Under SB 375, CARB is required to set regional vehicular GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2035. Additionally, SB 375 required that those targets be incorporated within a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), a newly required element within the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). On September 23, 2010, CARB adopted the vehicular GHG emissions reduction targets that require a 7–8 percent

reduction by 2020 and between 13 and 16 percent reduction by 2035 relative to emissions in 2005 for each MPO. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the MPO for the Southern California region and is required to work with local jurisdictions, including the City of Los Angeles. CARB has determined SCAG's reduction target for per capita vehicular emissions to be 8 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035. Achieving such reductions will require major changes in the transportation sector, travel behavior and mobility choices.

## **SB 743**

To further the State's commitment to the goals of SB 375, AB 32, and AB 1358, Governor Brown signed SB 743 on September 27, 2013. SB 743 adds Chapter 2.7, *Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit-Oriented Infill Projects*, to Division 13 (Section 21099) of the Public Resources Code. Key provisions of SB 743 include eliminating the measurement of vehicle delay, or level of service (LOS), as a metric that can be used for measuring traffic impacts. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis shifts from LOS to the reduction of VMT through the creation of multimodal transportation networks and promotion of a mix of land uses to reduce VMT. SB 743 required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the State CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to LOS for evaluating transportation impacts. Particularly for areas served by transit (i.e., transit priority areas [TPAs]), those alternative criteria must "promote the reduction of GHG emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses" (New Public Resources Code Section 21099[b][1]). Measurements of transportation impacts may include "vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated." OPR also has discretion to develop alternative criteria for areas that are not served by transit, if appropriate.

Pursuant to the mandate in SB 743, OPR adopted the revised State CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, recommending the use of VMT for analyzing transportation impacts under CEQA. In turn, Section 15064.3 was added to the State CEQA Guidelines and states "generally, vehicle miles traveled [VMT] is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts." The revised State CEQA Guidelines require that lead agencies remove automobile delay, as described solely by LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, as a criterion for determining a significant impact on the environment pursuant to CEQA, except in locations specifically identified in the revised guidelines, if any. In accordance with this requirement, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a), adopted in December 2018, states "a project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact." The requirements of SB 743 went into full effect as of July 1, 2020. Los Angeles County has developed Transportation Impact Guidelines consistent with SB 743, which are described below; these guidelines have been internally approved by Public Works, and Board approval is expected in 2021 following an extensive public outreach effort. Note that the guidelines are subject to change prior to adoption and/or may not ultimately be adopted.

## **Caltrans Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide**

In May 2020, Caltrans published a VMT-based *Transportation Impact Study Guide* (TISG) consistent with SB 743 (Caltrans 2020a). The TISG replaces the *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*. A key change is that CEQA documents will now consider different types of transportation impacts than previously examined. When analyzing the impact of VMT on the State Highway System resulting from local land use projects, the focus will no longer be on traffic at intersections and roadways immediately around project sites. Instead, the focus will be on how projects are likely to influence the overall amount of automobile use. The TISG is intended for use in analyzing land use

projects or plans that may impact or affect the State Highway System. It includes screening criteria to identify projects presumed to have a less-than-significant impact on VMT. For projects without a presumption of less-than-significant impact, Caltrans suggests use of OPR's 15 percent below existing city or regional VMT per capita recommended threshold of significance for land use projects and may request mitigation from projects and plans that do not meet those thresholds.

### **Caltrans Interim Land Development and Intergovernmental Review (LDIGR) Safety Review Practitioner's Guide**

In July 2020, Caltrans published the *Interim Land Development and Intergovernmental Review (LDIGR) Safety Review Practitioner's Guide* (Caltrans 2020b). This document establishes project effects on roadway safety as a potential transportation impact area under CEQA. The guidance is interim and does not establish thresholds of significance. It applies to proposed land use projects and plans affecting the State Highway System. Local agencies may also use the interim guidance as a model for review of local facilities. District traffic safety staff should use Caltrans' latest "Highway Safety Improvement Program Guidelines" to identify safety impacts based on traffic safety investigations generated by network screening, or initiated by the district, that may be affected by the proposed Project or plan and should assess safety improvements to mitigate potential conflicts or adverse impacts on potential or programmed remedial measures. Instructions on conducting an intergovernmental traffic safety review are provided in the interim guidance.

## **Regional**

### **Regional Transportation Improvement Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy**

SCAG is the designated MPO for six Southern California counties (Los Angeles, Ventura, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial), and is federally mandated to develop plans for regional transportation, land use and growth management, and air quality. The County is one of many local and regional jurisdictions comprising SCAG.

SCAG updates its long-range (i.e., minimum 20 years) RTP/SCS every 4 years, per federal law (23 U.S. Code Section 134 et seq.) and State law (SB 375). The SCS is a required element of the RTP that provides a plan for meeting GHG emissions reduction targets set forth by CARB. SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS "Connect SoCal" (SCAG 2020) was adopted in May 2020 for federal transportation conformity purposes; due to the Covid-19 pandemic the plan was approved in its entirety on September 3, 2020. The SCS is a required element of the RTP that provides a plan for meeting GHG emissions reduction targets set forth by CARB. It provides growth forecasts that are used in the development of air quality-related land use and transportation control strategies by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). CARB has determined SCAG's reduction target for per capita vehicular emissions to be 8 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035 relative to the 2005 baseline.

Successfully meeting these targets will require substantial effort to reduce VMT. The 2020–2045 RTP/SCS calls for investing \$638 billion over the 25-year term of the plan toward over 4,000 transportation projects, all of which collectively are expected to result in a 5 percent reduction in daily VMT per capita and a more than 25 percent decrease in traffic delay per capita. Investments will focus on maintaining and better managing the existing transportation network, expanding mobility choices, and increasing investment in transit and complete streets. Of the ten goals presented in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, five are applicable to transportation:



- **Goal 2:** Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods.
- **Goal 3:** Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system.
- **Goal 4:** Increase person and goods movement and travel choices within the transportation system.
- **Goal 7:** Adapt to a changing climate and support an integrated regional development pattern and transportation network.
- **Goal 8:** Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel.

## **Metro's Our Next LA Long Range Transportation Plan**

Metro's *2020 Long Range Transportation Plan* (LRTP), titled *Our Next LA*, was adopted by the Metro Board of Directors on September 24, 2020 and is the first update to the LRTP since 2009, and provides a vision for transportation in Los Angeles County through 2047. The plan aims to address population growth, changing mobility needs and preferences, technological advances, equitable access to opportunity, and adaptation to a changing environment. The plan details construction of an additional 100 miles of fixed-guideway transit, investments in arterial and freeway projects to reduce congestion, and construction of regional-scale bicycle and pedestrian projects to increase active transportation, including the Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor and the LA River Path. Other efforts detailed in the plan include traffic management practices for congested roadways (e.g., Express Lanes toll lanes), maintaining and upgrading the existing transportation system for all modes, and partnering with local, State, and federal agencies, and the private sector. *Our Next LA* includes transit and highway improvements funded by Measure M, as well as expansions of off-peak transit service, of the active transportation network, and of programs such as Express Lanes, partnerships to provide bus only lanes and freight management policies, and bold policy proposals, including free transit, faster bus trips, and sub-regional congestion pricing. (Metro 2020.)

## **Local**

### **Los Angeles County Transportation Impacts**

In response to SB 743, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has developed an update to its Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines ("County Guidelines") that includes a comprehensive methodological approach to the assessment of transportation impacts. The County Guidelines are based upon OPR technical guidance, but also reflect local conditions. The updated set of guidelines, methods, and impact criteria for CEQA analyses focus on VMT, roadway and intersection geometric hazards, and policy conflicts. They include VMT-based thresholds of significance and a process to screen out projects that will not require VMT analysis (due to their size, location, proximity to transit, or other factors). The new County Guidelines provide guidance on thresholds for new development projects that should be determined based on a project's land use, as described in the County Guidelines. (Public Works 2020.)

### **Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan**

In 2012, Los Angeles County updated its bicycle master plan, which is currently in the process of being updated by the County. It includes a vision for a diverse regional bicycle system of interconnected bicycle corridors, support facilities, and programs to make bicycling more practical and desirable. It focused on expanding the existing network, connecting gaps, addressing

constrained areas, providing greater connectivity at both the local and regional level, and encouraging more residents to bicycle more often. The plan proposed 831 miles of new bikeways over 20 years, including more than 70 miles of Class I bicycle facilities, almost 275 miles of Class II bicycle facilities, almost 465 miles of Class III sharrowed facilities, and more than 20 miles of bicycle boulevards. It also outlined a range of recommendations to increase bicycling, including developing complete streets, improving safety, increasing public awareness and supporting bicycling.

The County maintains a 16.7-mile portion of the LA River Bike Path extending from the Shoreline Bikeway in Long Beach to Atlantic Boulevard in the City of Vernon. The communities of Rancho Dominguez and East Rancho Dominguez are the only unincorporated communities adjacent to the LA River Bike Path. South of Imperial Highway, the LA River Bike Path runs along the east bank of the river. At Imperial Highway in South Gate, at the confluence of the LA River and Rio Hondo, the path splits into two directions. The LA River Bike Path continues north, although the path switches over to the west bank where it continues along the river until its terminus at Atlantic Boulevard. The path along the east bank becomes Rio Hondo Path north of Imperial Highway, and continues northeasterly along the Rio Hondo. The following goals, policies, and implementation actions from the *Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan* are relevant to transportation (Los Angeles County 2012).

**Goal 1 – Bikeway System** – Expanded, improved, and interconnected system of county bikeways and bikeway support facilities to provide a viable transportation alternative for all levels of bicycling abilities, particularly for trips of less than five miles.

- **Policy 1.1** – Construct the bikeways proposed in 2012 County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan over the next 20 years.
  - **IA 1.1.1** – Propose and prioritize bikeways that connect to transit stations, commercial centers, schools, libraries, cultural centers, parks, and other important activity centers within each unincorporated area and promote bicycling to these destinations.
  - **IA 1.1.2** – Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions and Metro to implement bicycle facilities that promote connectivity.
- **Policy 1.4** – Support the development of bicycle facilities that encourage new riders.
  - **IA 1.4.2** – Provide landscaping along bikeways where appropriate.
  - **IA 1.4.4** – Allow the use of and promote new and/or innovative bicycle facility designs and standards on County bicycle facilities.
- **Policy 1.6** – Develop a bicycle parking policy.
  - **IA 1.6.1** – Identify where bicycle parking facilities are needed and identify the appropriate type.

**Goal 2 – Safety** – Increased safety of roadways for all users.

- **Policy 2.2** – Encourage alternative street standards that improve safety such as lane reconfigurations and traffic calming.
  - **IA 2.2.3** – Investigate the use of reflective striping alternatives on Class I bike paths that would address concerns with slippery conditions that generally result from traditional reflective striping.
- **Policy 2.3** – Support traffic enforcement activities that increase bicyclists' safety.
  - Encourage enforcement agencies to conduct traffic enforcement on Class I Bikeways.
- **Policy 2.4** – Evaluate impacts on bicyclists when designing new or reconfiguring streets.
  - **IA 2.4.2** – Conduct biennial counts of bicyclists on key bikeways to gauge the effectiveness of the county's bicycle facilities in increasing bicycle activity.

- **IA 2.4.3** – Use alternative Level of Service standards that account for bicycles and pedestrians.

**Goal 4** – Encouragement Programs

- **Policy 4.2** – Encourage non-automobile commuting.
- **Policy 4.3** – Develop maps and wayfinding signage and striping to assist navigating the regional bikeways.

### **Los Angeles River Master Plan (1996)**

The *Los Angeles River Master Plan* was adopted by Los Angeles County in 1996 (Los Angeles County 1996). Its overarching goal was to improve the aesthetic, recreational, and environmental condition of the LA River and its tributary, the Tujunga Wash, while still recognizing the primary need for flood management. The plan envisioned a continuous bikeway along both the LA River and the Tujunga Wash. It included strategies to improve conditions for bicyclists using the river path for both transportation and recreational cycling, for example planting a continuous greenway of trees along the river to provide shade and visual relief along the corridor and implementation of zoning requirements and development incentives for properties along the river to potentially increase access to destinations. Plan design guidelines provided a framework for bike path landscaping, access improvements, signage, fencing, and maintenance. Plan projects fell into six groupings:

- Aesthetic improvements
- Economic development
- Environmental enhancements
- Flood management and water conservation
- Jurisdiction and public involvement
- Recreation

Given the primary need for flood management, all projects were to be designed in accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Los Angeles County flood management standards. It was assumed that impacts on the transportation system would be less than significant.

### **Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (2007)**

The *Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan* (LARRMP) (City of Los Angeles 2007) provides a framework for restoring the river’s ecological function and for transforming it into an amenity for residents and visitors. The LARRMP was prepared for the 32-mile length of the LA River within the City of Los Angeles. The plan’s goals include the following:

- Revitalize the Los Angeles River through enhanced flood storage, water quality, public safety, and ecosystem.
- Green the neighborhoods with a continuous Los Angeles River greenway, extended open space and recreation, and public art along the Los Angeles River.
- Capture community opportunities by making the Los Angeles River the focus of activity, providing opportunities for educational and public facilities, and celebrating the cultural heritage of the Los Angeles River.
- Create value with improved quality of life, focused attention on underused areas and disadvantaged communities, and increased employment, housing, and retail space opportunities.

The LARRMP includes recommendations for the following:

- Physical improvements to the Los Angeles River corridor and to the green space network in adjacent neighborhoods
- Management of public access on a policy level and ensuring public health and safety
- Recommendations for a Los Angeles River governance and management structure; and
- Recommendations for short- and long-term priority projects and potential funding strategies.

The long-term vision for the LARRMP includes restoring a continuous, functioning riparian ecosystem along the LA River corridor. This would involve restoring riparian vegetation to support birds and mammals and, ideally, developing fish passages, fish ladders, and riffle pools to allow for restoration of steelhead trout habitat. The City of Los Angeles' Adopted Capital Improvement Expenditure Program includes a listing of projects that relate to the LA River revitalization effort, as reported by the City's administrative officer. The project listing includes bridges, recreational bike paths, parks and associated facilities, and riparian restoration features.

### **Los Angeles Countywide Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment**

In 2016, the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation published the *Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment*. The assessment was designed to quantify the need for parks and recreation resources and the potential costs of meeting that need. The assessment identified parks as key urban infrastructure and used five metrics to identify overall park need: park condition, park access, park amenities, park land, and park pressure. Park pressure examines the effect on parks of population density by capturing the potential demand if each resident of the County were to use the park closest to them. If population density surrounding a park is high and/or park acreage is low, there is likely to be a park need that would otherwise escape detection using only park land and access metrics. Parks with a small number of acres per 1,000 nearby residents are likely to be more heavily used than parks with a larger number of acres per 1,000 residents. Areas surrounding the LA River's east-west stretch through the San Fernando Valley were identified as being park-rich, whereas almost all the areas surrounding the river's north-south stretch through Downtown Los Angeles and South Los Angeles were identified as having a high or very high park need. (Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation 2016.)

### **Lower LA River Revitalization Plan**

The *Lower LA River Revitalization Plan* seeks to achieve the LA River's potential value as a place for relaxation, discovery, recreation, tourism, and economic development. It is organized around three overarching themes: interconnectedness of the people, the culture, the river, and the watershed; nontraditional education pathways and place-based learning, engaging a wide audience; and multiple benefit thinking, leveraging education and connectedness. The plan describes opportunities for improving the environment and quality of life along the river. Along with specific project opportunities, the plan includes four project templates designed to enable rapid revitalization, connectivity, and consistency between new projects. It also provides tools to help prevent the displacement of residents and local businesses as revitalization-induced investments occur throughout the corridor. A Community Stabilization Toolkit (the Toolkit) was developed to highlight policies and programs that can be used to protect the existing river-adjacent communities. (Lower Los Angeles River Working Group 2018.)

## Los Angeles County Vision Zero Action Plan

The *Vision Zero Los Angeles County: A Plan for Safer Roadways*, published in November 2019 and adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in August 2020, focuses County efforts for the years 2020–2025 to achieve the goal of eliminating traffic-related fatalities on unincorporated County roadways by 2035. The plan includes a vision for the future, objectives, and actions to enhance traffic safety. It is guided by principles of health equity, data driven processes, and transparency. It identifies Collision Concentration Corridors throughout the unincorporated areas of the County, any half-mile roadway segment on which three or more fatal or severe injury collisions occurred over a 5-year period from 2013–2017. Strategies to enhance roadway safety and reduce collisions include a wide range of roadway enhancements, such as lighting, curb extensions, and pedestrian signal timing, and a commitment to collaborate on data analysis and develop partnerships across jurisdictions. The plan is structured around five objectives: enhancing County processes and collaboration; addressing health inequities and protecting vulnerable users; collaborating with communities to enhance roadway safety; fostering a culture of traffic safety; and transparency, responsiveness, and accountability. (Los Angeles County 2019.)

## Municipal General Plans, Bicycle Master Plans, and Climate Actions Plans

The 18 jurisdictions (17 cities and unincorporated area) within the study area set transportation policy through the circulation or mobility element of their general plans, and through other policy documents such as bicycle master plans or climate action plans. While it is good practice for these documents to be updated regularly, there is no regulatory timeframe governing their update, and some cities have not updated their general plans or circulation elements since the early 1990s. Additionally, while almost all of the cities identify specific policy goals surrounding transportation along the LA River, not all do, and in most cases, there is little framework in place for interjurisdictional coordination between river cities toward LA River development.

The relevant policies from each city’s regulatory documents are provided below.

### Frame 1

#### *City of Long Beach*

##### *Mobility Element of the City’s General Plan (City of Long Beach 2013)*

- **Strategy No. 1** – Establish a network of complete streets that complements the related street type.
  - **MOP Policy 1-9** – Increase mode shift of transit, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- **Strategy No. 2** – Reconfigure streets to emphasize their modal priorities.
  - **MOP Policy 2-16** – Close gaps in the existing bikeway system<sup>2</sup>.
- **Strategy No. 5** – Reduce the environmental impacts of the transportation system.
  - **MOP Policy 5-2** – Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle trips through the use of alternative modes of transportation and TDM.

##### *Bicycle Master Plan 2040 (City of Long Beach 2017)*

- **Strategy 1** – Develop a comprehensive bikeway network.

<sup>2</sup> The Mobility Element planned seven bike/ped bridges across the LA River.

- **1.1** – Expand, improve, and connect the bikeway network to provide a viable transportation option for all levels of bicycling abilities.
- **1.4** – Upgrade bridges, intersections, freeway ramps, tunnels, and any other obstacles that impede safe and convenient bicycle passage.

### **Los Angeles County**

#### *Los Angeles County General Plan (Los Angeles County 2015a)*

- **Goal M2** – Interconnected and safe bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly streets, sidewalks, paths, and trails that promote active transportation and transit use.
  - **Policy M2.5** – Ensure a comfortable bicycling environment by implementing the following, whenever appropriate and feasible:
    - Appropriate lighting on all bikeways, including those in rural areas.
  - **Policy M2.7** – Require sidewalks, trails, and bikeways to accommodate the existing and projected volume of pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle activity, consider both the paved width and the unobstructed width available for walking.
  - **Policy M2.8** – Connect trails and pedestrian and bicycle paths to schools, public transportation, major employment centers, shopping centers, government buildings, residential neighborhoods, and other destinations.
- **Goal M4** – An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents.
  - **Policy M4.1** – Expand transportation options that reduce automobile dependence.
  - **Policy M4.10** – Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks.
  - **Policy M4.12** – Work with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure connectivity and the creation of an integrated regional network.
- **Goal M7** – Transportation networks that minimize negative impacts to the environment and communities.
  - **Policy M7.1** – Minimize roadway runoff through the use of permeable surface materials, and other low impact designs, wherever feasible.

#### *Community Climate Action Plan (Los Angeles County 2015b)*

- **LUT-1** – Bicycle Programs and Supporting Facilities – Construct and improve bicycle infrastructure to increase bicycling and bicyclist access to transit and transit stations/hubs. Increase bicycle parking and “end-of-trip” facilities.
- **LUT-11** – Sustainable Pavements Program – Reduce energy consumption and waste generation associated with pavement maintenance and rehabilitation.

### **City of Los Angeles**

#### *Mobility Plan 2035: An Element of the General Plan (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2016)*

- **Chapter 1** – Safety First
  - **Policy 1.9** – Recreational Trail Safety – Balance user needs on the city’s public recreational trails.
- **Chapter 2** – World Class Infrastructure

- **Policy 2.3** – Pedestrian Infrastructure – Recognize walking as a component of every trip, and ensure high-quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public right-of-way modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.
- **Policy 2.6** – Bicycle Networks – Provide safe, convenient, and comfortable local and regional bicycling facilities for people of all types and abilities.
- **Policy 2.12** – Walkway and Bikeway Accommodations – Design for pedestrian and bicycle travel when rehabilitating or installing a new bridge, tunnel, or exclusive transit right-of-way.
- **Chapter 3** – Access for All Angelenos
  - **Policy 3.2** – People with Disabilities – Accommodate the needs of people with disabilities when modifying or installing infrastructure in the public right-of-way.
  - **Policy 3.11** – Open Streets – Facilitate regular “open street” events and repurposing of the public right-of-way.
- **Chapter 4** – Collaboration, Communication & Informed Choices
  - **Policy 4.11** – Cohesive Regional Mobility – Communicate and partner with the Southern California Association of Governments, Metro, and adjacent cities and local transit operators to plan and operate a cohesive regional mobility system.
  - **Policy 4.14** – Wayfinding – Provide widespread, user-friendly information about mobility options and local destinations, delivered through a variety of channels and including traditional signage and digital platforms.
- **Chapter 5** – Clean Environments & Healthy Communities
  - **Policy 5.1** – Sustainable Transportation – Encourage the development of a sustainable transportation system that promotes environmental and public health.
  - **Policy 5.2** – Vehicle Miles Traveled – Support ways to reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita.
  - **ENG.16** – Los Angeles River – Implement Greenway 2020 (a locally led effort to complete the bicycle path along the entire 32-mile stretch of the Los Angeles River by 2020) and Los Angeles River Greenway Trail to provide a multi-generational trail and provide active transportation options to disadvantaged communities.

## Frame 2

### *City of Long Beach*

Applicable regulations are described above.

### *City of Carson*

#### *Carson General Plan – Transportation and Infrastructure Element (City of Carson 2004)*

- **Goal TI-4** – Increase the use of alternate forms of transportation generated in, and traveling through, the City of Carson.
  - **Policy TI-4.3** – Provide appropriate bicycle access throughout the City by implementing the Bicycle Plan.
  - **TI-IM-4.10** – Complete an approve Bicycle Plan (as defined by the MTA) and implement it as availability arises through private development, private grants, public grants

(particularly the MTA call for projects) signing of shared routes, and cooperation with other agencies such as the County of Los Angeles for bicycle routes along channels<sup>3</sup>.

- **TI-IM-4.13** – Continue coordination of bicycle route planning and implementation with adjacent jurisdictions and regional agencies.

### ***City of Compton***

*Draft Compton General Plan 2030 (City of Compton 2011)*

The *Draft Compton General Plan 2030* does not contain any river-specific transportation policies.

*City of Compton Bicycle Master Plan (City of Compton 2015)*

#### *Plan Goals*

- Improve the health of all Compton residents by making the healthy choice the easy choice.
  - Create a comprehensive system of bikeways that connects key destinations.

The *City of Compton Bicycle Master Plan* includes a number of facilities connecting to the LA River, including a new path on the west bank, as well as participation in Metro Bike, with a station along the LA River.

### ***Unincorporated County***

Applicable regulations for unincorporated County are described above in *Frame 1*.

## **Frame 3**

### ***City of Compton***

Applicable regulations for Compton are described above.

### ***City of Cudahy***

*Cudahy 2040 General Plan – Circulation Element (City of Cudahy 2018a)*

- **Goal CE-2** – Improved mobility and safety through roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities enhancements and increased public transit connectivity.
  - **Policy CE-2.1** – Create, adopt, and implement a Bicycle Master plan.

#### *LA River Access*

Increasing access points and enhancing connections to the River is a priority. Planned connections on Clara, Elizabeth, and Cecilia Streets.

#### *River Road Repurposing*

River Road will be closed to vehicular traffic and redesigned as a place for people to engage in active transportation and recreation. The River Road Green will also allow for direct pedestrian and bike connections to the LA River. The River Road Green streetscape elements include landscaping (including shade trees), pedestrian-scale lighting, and wayfinding signs.

---

<sup>3</sup> Master Plan of Bikeways completed in 2013, includes a proposed facility on Del Amo Boulevard which would connect to the LA River.



*Cudahy 2040 General Plan – Open Space and Conservation Element (City of Cudahy 2018b)*

- **Policy OSCE-2.12** – Consider ways to improve access to the LA River Trail from Cudahy by addressing differences in grade and increasing the number of points of access.

**City of Downey***Downey Vision 2025 General Plan, Circulation Element (City of Downey 2005)*

- **Goal 2.2.2.2** – Establish a bikeway master plan to link employment centers, recreational facilities, and bikeways along the Rio Hondo River, the San Gabriel River, UPRR, and those of neighboring communities via a network of bike routes, lanes, and paths.

**City of Lynwood***City of Lynwood General Plan (City of Lynwood 2003)*

- **Policy CIRC-2.2** – Lane and Trails Policy – Provide a circulation network that accommodates the safe and efficient movement of cyclists on bike lanes and bike trails.
  - **CIRC Implementation Measure 25.0** – Off-street bicycle trails should use open space corridors, flood control, and utility easements where possible. Such trails shall minimize automobile cross traffic within the City.

**City of Paramount***Paramount General Plan – Land Use Element (City of Paramount 2007)*

- **Land Use Element Policy 17** – The City of Paramount will develop new open space areas in utility rights-of-way, along the LA River, and as part of future park development.

**City of South Gate***City of South Gate Bicycle Transportation Plan (City of South Gate 2012)*

The proposed bikeway network...includes several new bicycle and pedestrian bridges over the I-710 and the LA River, and several access improvements to the bicycle path on the LA River.

- **Policy 1** – The City will develop a complete bikeway network throughout South Gate.

*South Gate General Plan 2035 – Mobility Element (2009a)*

- **Policy ME 1.2 P.1** – The City should improve the street system by adding to the street grid in the north-east part of the City to relieve the Firestone/Atlantic intersection, including providing additional overcrossings of the LA River and the I-710 freeway, and an additional north-south collector street between Atlantic Avenue and the LA river.
- **Policy ME 2.1 P.1** – The City should develop and maintain a citywide bicycle network of off-street bike paths, on-street bike lanes, and bike streets.
- **Implementation Action ME 1.4** – Area Bounded by I-710, Tweedy Boulevard, Atlantic Avenue, UP Railroad Corridor (east-west): Conduct studies to explore/implement improvements to the currently lacking street grid in this area in order to relieve pressure on the intersection of Firestone Boulevard and Atlantic Avenue.
- **Implementation Action ME 1.9** – Independence Avenue/Ardmore Avenue: Extend eastwards as a Collector Street to Atlantic Avenue, then easterly across the LA River and I-710 Freeway (with possible ramp connection) to Garfield Avenue. The cross-section should include bike lanes.
- **Implementation Action ME 1.11** – Southern Avenue: Extend east, as an Avenue (four lanes), across the LA River and the I-710 Freeway to connect to Garfield Avenue.

- **Action ME 21** – Improve bicycle access to the regional bike paths on the LA River and the Rio Hondo Channel.

*South Gate General Plan 2035 – Green City Element (City of South Gate 2009b)*

- **GC 2.1 P.1** – New trails should contribute to increased connectivity across the City by reducing pedestrian and cycle travel times, integrating with existing sidewalks, bike lanes, and other bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure, and providing an alternative mode of access to goods services, and other desirable destinations.
- **GC 2.1 P.3** – Whenever possible, trails should be multi-use, accommodating both cyclists and pedestrians.
- **GC 2.1 P.5** – The City should enhance the existing Class I bicycle facilities that run along the east side of the Rio Hondo Channel and the west side of the LA River, transforming them from underutilized pathways to beautified, connected pedestrian and bicycle thoroughfares with amenities such as benches, tables, and lighting.
- **GC 2.1 P.6** – The City will pursue a Class I trail along the LADWP right-of-way that connects the west side of the City to the LA River.
- **GC 2.1 P.7** – The City will pursue a Class I trail along the railroad right-of-way between Ardmore and Independence Avenues. This trail should connect the College District with the potential Gateway Transit Village and the LA River.
- **GC 2.2 P.1** – The City will plan for the continuation of equestrian facilities along the LA River and Rio Hondo Channel.

***Unincorporated County***

Applicable regulations are described above.

**Frame 4**

***City of Bell***

*City of Bell 2030 General Plan (City of Bell 2018)*

The *City of Bell 2030 General Plan* does not contain any river-specific transportation policies.

*City of Bell Bicycle Master Plan (City of Bell 2016)*

**Goal 3** – Promote community health

- Create connectivity to community assets (parks, schools, riverbed)

***City of Bell Gardens***

*City of Bell Gardens General Plan 2010 (City of Bell Gardens 1995)*

The *City of Bell Gardens General Plan 2010* does not contain any river-specific transportation policies.

***City of Commerce***

*City of Commerce 2020 General Plan (City of Commerce 2008)*

The *City of Commerce 2020 General Plan* does not contain any river-specific transportation policies.

### **City of Huntington Park**

#### *City of Huntington Park 2030 General Plan – Mobility Element (City of Huntington Park 2017)*

- **Mobility & Circulation Element Policy 18** – The City of Huntington Park shall work with adjacent jurisdictions and Metro to develop a network of on-street bike lanes or off-street bike paths.

### **City of Maywood**

#### *City of Maywood General Plan – Circulation Element (City of Maywood 2008)*

- **Policy 4.3** – Support efforts to link the bicycle path system to the LA River Bicycle Trail. Coordinate with organizations such as the Northeast Trees to create regional bicycle path system.
  - **Action C-12** – Coordinate with the County and Metro to improve City bicycle route connections to the LA County bicycle route system. Encourage links to transit stations and the LA River Bicycle Trail.

### **City of Vernon**

#### *City of Vernon General Plan – Circulation and Infrastructure Element (City of Vernon 2015a)*

- **Atlantic Boulevard Bridge Widening** – The City of Vernon is planning to widen the Atlantic Boulevard Bridge over the LA River. The project plans to widen bridge to six lanes.
- **Policy CI-1.1** – Continue to improve the street system to meet the minimum standards contained in this Element.
- **Policy CI-1.12** – Cooperate with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and other local agencies in their efforts to complete a bicycle path along the levee of the LA River connecting to adjacent jurisdictions.

#### *City of Vernon General Plan – Resources Element (City of Vernon 2015b)*

- **Policy R-3.2** – Cooperate with regional efforts to upgrade the appearance and open space value of the LA River Channel.

#### *City of Vernon Bicycle Master Plan (City of Vernon 2017)*

- **Objective 1.B** – Eliminate barriers and gaps in the bikeway network.
  - **Strategy 1.B.1** – Pursue construction of a Class I bicycle path along the LA River between the current path terminus at Atlantic Boulevard and the northern city boundary.
  - **Strategy 1.B.2** – Identify connections to and from the existing and planned LA River bicycle path.
  - **Strategy 1.B.3** – Identify opportunities to improve bicycle connectivity across the LA River and I-710.
  - **Strategy 1.B.4** – Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to construct bikeways that provide continuous connections across jurisdictional boundaries.

### **Unincorporated County**

Applicable regulations are described above.

**Frame 5*****City of Los Angeles***

Applicable regulations are described above.

**Frame 6*****City of Los Angeles***

Applicable regulations are described above.

***City of Glendale******City of Glendale General Plan – Circulation Element (City of Glendale 1998)***

- **Goal 2** – Construct the complete bikeway system as identified in the Bikeway Master Plan.

***Greener Glendale Plan (City of Glendale 2012a)***

Glendale is...committed to using 100% of its LA riverfront as a recreational amenity. The riverfront will provide nearly a mile of multi-use trail, several small riverfront parks, and an equestrian facility.

- **Urban Nature Objective UN4** – Ensure there is accessible park and recreational open space to serve residents.
  - **Urban Nature Strategy UN4-C** – Continue to maintain and develop recreational trails.

***Bicycle Transportation Plan (City of Glendale 2012b)***

- **Policy 1** – The City will develop a complete bikeway network throughout Glendale
  - **Action** – Implement planned citywide network of bikeway improvements.

According to the *City of Glendale Bicycle Transportation Plan*, the City of Glendale proposes to “add a multipurpose bicycle and pedestrian path along north side of LA River from Flower St. to Verdugo Wash/LA River confluence (near Fairmont Ave. Flyover).” It also “plans to build a bridge over the LA River to connect Glendale to the LA River bicycle path and Griffith Park.”

- Potential river access at Doran Street

**Frame 7*****City of Los Angeles***

Applicable regulations are described above.

***City of Burbank******City of Burbank Bicycle Master Plan (City of Burbank 2009)***

- **Objective B** – Identify and implement a network of bikeways that is feasible, fundable, and that serves all bicyclists’ needs, especially for travel to employment centers, schools, commercial and retail districts, transit stations, and institutions, while not excluding the needs of recreational cyclists.
- **Objective B Policy Action 8** – Create strong connections between the regional Class I bike paths (Los Angeles River, Chandler, and San Fernando), as well as Metrolink Stations.

*Burbank 2035 General Plan – Mobility Element 2035 (City of Burbank 2013a)*

- **Goal 2 – Sustainability**
  - **Policy 2.1** – Improve Burbank’s alternative transportation access to local and regional destinations through land use decisions that support multimodal transportation.
  - **Policy 2.3** – Prioritize investments in transportation projects and programs that support viable alternatives to automobile use.
- **Goal 5 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility**
  - **Policy 5.2** – Implement the Bicycle Master Plan by maintaining and expanding the bicycle network, providing end-of-trip facilities, improving bicycle/transit integration, encouraging bicycle use, and making bicycling safer.

The LA River bike bridge is a funded project.

*Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (City of Burbank 2013b)*

- **Measure T-1.4 – Bicycle Infrastructure Expansion**

The bicycle master plan identifies an additional 12.0 miles of Class I and Class II facilities as top priority projects. Approximately 5.0 miles of these top priority projects have already received funding and are currently in various stages of development, including the South Channel Bikeway, the San Fernando Bikeway, extension of the Verdugo bike lanes, the Keystone Bicycle Boulevard project, and the LA River Bike Bridge project. Future bicycle lane expansion should focus on connecting high-visitation sites (e.g., dense residential areas, commercial and employment centers, transit hubs, parks and recreation areas) with Class I and II facilities to encourage a travel mode shift from cars to bicycles, especially for non-commute trips.

***Unincorporated County***

Applicable regulations are described above.

**Frame 8*****City of Los Angeles***

Applicable regulations are described above.

**Frame 9*****City of Los Angeles***

Applicable regulations are described above.

## 3.16.3 Impact Analysis

### 3.16.3.1 Methods

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a) establishes increases in VMT as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts, and states that other considerations may include effects on transit and non-motorized travel. VMT as a metric for impacts is consistent with a broad range of State legislation, regional, and local programs, and plans and policies, and as such, the State CEQA

Guidelines also require consideration of whether a project may conflict either directly or indirectly with plans, policies, programs, or ordinances addressing the circulation system, particularly related to increases in VMT and associated reductions in GHG generation, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The State has set ambitious targets for reductions in GHG generation, which in turn relates to transportation and required reductions in VMT, as transportation is the largest generator of GHGs by sector in the State (41 percent).

Thus, legislation, programs, plans, and policies that target GHG generation and climate change relate directly to transportation and the need to reduce VMT. The proposed Project's objectives to provide 51 continuous miles of equitable, inclusive, and safe multi-use trails, and to enhance opportunities for equitable access to the river corridor directly support State VMT reduction goals. The proposed Project's consistency with applicable legislation, plans, and policies is discussed below under Impact 3.16(a); while the potential impacts on VMT associated with implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are assessed in the context of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) under Impact 3.16(b). Impact 3.16(c)/(d) addresses the issue of whether implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would substantially increase hazards because of geometric design features or could result in inadequate emergency access.

In response to SB 743, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has approved an update to its Transportation Impact Guidelines that includes a comprehensive systematic approach to the assessment of transportation impacts. The County's Transportation Impact Guidelines are based upon OPR technical guidance, but also reflect local conditions. The updated guidelines, methods, and impact criteria for CEQA analyses focus on VMT, roadway and intersection geometric hazards, and policy conflicts. They include guidance on VMT-based thresholds of significance and a process to screen out projects that will not require VMT analysis (due to their size, location, proximity to transit, or other factors). The analysis contained herein is consistent with a uniform approach across all 17 cities through which the study area extends. This uniform approach is appropriate because Los Angeles County is the lead agency for the PEIR and because all of the other jurisdictions currently are at some stage in the process of transitioning from LOS to VMT methodologies for CEQA compliance.

The following screening checklist from the Guidelines, developed by the County aligned with the OPR *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts* (December 2018) for use in transportation impact analysis, was reviewed to help evaluate whether the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1) by causing substantial increases in vehicle miles traveled.

For land use projects:

- **Non-Retail Project Trip Generation:** Would the land use project generate a net increase of 110 or more daily trips?
- **Retail Project Site Plan:** Would the project contain retail uses that exceed a net 50,000 square feet of gross floor area?
- **Location-based:** Would the project be located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor?

*This screening criteria has not been considered in this VMT impact evaluation. Locations of major transit stops or high-quality transit corridors may change over the 25-year buildout timeframe for the 2020 LA River Master Plan. When specific locations for subsequent projects*

*have been selected, applicability of this screening criteria should be considered based on adjacency to transit stops and corridors existing at that time. Transit accessibility is recommended as a specific criterion in site selection to ensure maximum accessibility via non-private vehicle modes.*

- **Residential Land Use:** Would the project consist of 100% affordable housing?

For transportation projects:

- Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)?; and
- Would the project include the addition of through-traffic lanes on existing or new highways, including general purpose lanes, high-occupancy vehicle lanes, peak period lanes, auxiliary lanes, and lanes through grade-separated interchanges (except managed lanes, transit lanes, and auxiliary lanes of less than one mile in length designed to improve roadway safety)?

Impacts associated with Typical Projects (i.e., the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways), the six KOP categories, and related design components—as well as the *2020 LA River Master Plan* in its entirety—are analyzed qualitatively at a program level. Where the two Typical Projects or the six KOP categories have similar impacts related to a specific criteria, the discussion is combined. Where differences between the Typical Projects or the KOP categories are identified, the impact analysis is presented separately.

### 3.16.3.2 Criteria for Determining Significance

#### Thresholds of Significance

For the purposes of the analysis in this PEIR, and in accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project would have a significant environmental impact if it would:

- 3.16(a)** Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- 3.16(b)** Conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).
- 3.16(c) and (d)** Substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) OR result in inadequate emergency access.

### 3.16.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#### Impact 3.16(a): Would the proposed Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

##### Typical Projects

###### Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways

Construction is a temporary condition (assumed to range from 10 to 20 weeks), and there are very few plans, programs, or policies addressing the construction phase that are relevant to the Common Elements or Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects. Therefore, due to the similarity of impacts, the construction period impacts for Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects are discussed together in the following section.

###### Construction

No long-term closures of offsite roadways, bicycle or equestrian paths, or sidewalks are anticipated. As such, while the specific details of the location, design, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under Typical Projects are not known, traffic and circulation impacts are not anticipated to be of a magnitude such that they could conflict with any programs, plans, or policies addressing the circulation system, or transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. However, the Typical Project elements could involve intermittent lane and sidewalk closures during construction of those elements, which could impede vehicle, pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle circulation. These impacts have the potential to be significant.

###### Impact Determination

Impacts would be potentially significant.

###### Mitigation Measures

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

##### **Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

###### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

###### Operations

The 2020 LA River Master Plan Actions that directly relate to transportation include:

1. Action 2.1 Create 51 miles of connected spaces along the river.
2. Action 2.2 Complete the LA River Trail so that there is a continuous route along the entire river and encourage future routes on both sides where feasible.



3. Action 2.2.1 In places where the right of way is too narrow for a river trail, pursue easements on adjacent property to complete the trail or utilize bridges, platforms, or cantilevers.
4. Action 2.2.2 Increase the extent of multi-use trails parallel to the river with separate paths for active transport, pedestrians, and equestrians, especially in areas of high traffic.
5. Action 2.2.3 Provide bicycle parking and encourage bicycle rental facilities and bike share along the river.
6. Action 4.1 Create welcoming access points and gateways to the LA River and LA River Trail to optimize physical access along its length, on both sides.
7. Action 4.1.1. Make the river trail and gateways universally accessible and inclusive.
8. Action 4.1.2 Prioritize access for areas with limited access or areas that need improvements to existing access points.
9. Action 4.1.3 Prioritize access near major destinations, including schools, libraries, parks, transit stops, and job centers.
10. Action 4.1.4 Encourage the development of safe routes to the river.
11. Action 4.1.5 Obtain easements adjacent to the river to create access.
12. Action 4.2 Increase safe transportation routes to the river.
13. Action 4.2.1 Coordinate with LA County transportation plans, including Vision Zero, the Bicycle Master Plan, Metro plans, municipally adopted transportation plans, and the Step by Step Pedestrian Plan.
14. Action 4.2.2 Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections across the river every half mile.
15. Action 4.2.3 Encourage all new pedestrian or road bridges over the river to provide pedestrian and bicycle access to the river trail.
16. Action 4.2.4 Provide continuous pathways between the river and nearby recreation spaces.
17. Action 4.2.5 Encourage cities to adopt complete streets policies to better connect neighborhoods to the river.
18. Action 4.2.6 Increase the extent of multiuse trails that connect to the river with separate paths for active transport, pedestrians, and equestrians.
19. Action 4.2.7 Coordinate with transportation agencies to enhance public transit to and along the river.
20. Action 4.2.8 Coordinate with transportation planning to encourage transit lines that cross the river to have stops that provide access to the river trail.
21. Action 4.2.9 Promote the use of public transportation to get to and from the river trail.
22. Action 4.2.10 Develop information materials and signage that highlight the river trail as a transportation route to major job centers and destinations.
23. Action 7.5.2 Encourage existing river-adjacent development to orient its “front door” toward the river and public transportation.

The transportation elements of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are only one component of a much broader project with a focus on flood management, habitat restoration, biological resource

preservation, and community engagement. These transportation-related actions can be grouped into three high-level categories:

- The creation of a continuous trail along both river banks for the entirety of the LA River's 51 miles
- Provision of equitable, inclusive, and safe parks, open spaces, and trails
- Enhancement of opportunities for equitable access to the river corridor

For more than a decade, transportation plans and policies at the State level have focused on reducing GHG emissions to meet State climate goals. Local plans and policies have focused on building and expanding bicycle and pedestrian networks, improving roadway safety, and reducing collisions, expanding access to open spaces, and improving regional and local transit connectivity.

Implementation of the proposed Project would create a continuous 51-mile trail, providing a comfortable off-road backbone facility through Los Angeles County, free of conflicts with vehicles, for long-distance commuting via active transportation modes such as bicycles, scooters, and walking or running. Access points would be provided every half mile along the path, increasing neighborhood connectivity to the trails and open spaces developed within the River Corridor, creating new neighborhood parks and reducing or eliminating the need to travel extended distances via private vehicle to reach a neighborhood park for the tens of thousands of people who live adjacent to the LA River. Pedestrians, bicyclists and other micro-mobility mode users and equestrians would find space for travel and recreation along the River Corridor on multi-use trails designed to equally accommodate them.

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* will allow for an increased share of trips to be completed via active transportation instead of by private vehicle. Of importance in a county without many long-distance Class I bicycle trails in developed areas, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* will allow for cross-county commuting via active transportation. Increasing the active transportation mode share and the ability to replace long-distance vehicle commute trips with an active transportation trip will reduce VMT, consistent with State and regional policy initiatives, including SB 743 and SCAG's RTP. It is also consistent with RTP Goal 6, which seeks to protect the environment and the health of SCAG region residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation.

Locally, the *Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan* sets forth a vision for a regional bicycle system of interconnected corridors with support facilities to encourage and make bicycling more comfortable. The robust suite of common elements—including pavilions and benches for rest and shade, bicycle racks to lock up a bicycle, bathrooms to meet bodily needs, and cafes for refreshment—intended to be placed frequently along the path will support bicycle trips in general, particularly longer-distance ones, and encourage hesitant bicyclists to hit the trail. Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* particularly addresses *Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan Policy 1.4*, which supports the development of bicycle facilities that encourage new riders, Implementation Action 1.4.2 to provide landscaping along bikeways where appropriate, and Implementation Action 1.4.4 to allow the use of and promote new and/or innovative bicycle facility designs and standards on County bicycle facilities.

Los Angeles County's *Vision Zero* action plan seeks to eliminate traffic-related fatalities and severe injuries on unincorporated County roadways by 2035. By providing a framework for construction of a 51-mile continuous off-street path for active transportation trips, implementation of the *2020 LA*

*River Master Plan* will provide Los Angeles County residents with a safe corridor for active transportation trips free of risk from injury or death by collision with a motor vehicle.

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* will allow the County to achieve many of the goals and policies from its general plan Mobility Element. Goals and policies supported by *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation include Goal M2, Policies M2.5 and M2.7; Goal M4, Policies M4.1, M4.10, and M4.12; and Goal M7, Policy M7.1, all of which relate to active transportation and reducing automobile dependence.

Similarly, implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is consistent with active transportation-related goals, policies, and policy actions of the other 17 jurisdictions through which the river flows, as detailed in Chapter 2, *Project Description*. As such, the proposed Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

### **2020 LA River Master Plan Kit of Parts**

The Common Elements Typical Project analyzed above could be implemented in whole or as a combination of its individual elements with the KOPs discussed below. Therefore, for potential impacts of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects, see above. The impact discussion below focuses on specific KOPs only.

The design components analyzed in this section include those listed in Chapter 2, *Project Description*. Each KOP is analyzed separately where differences in impacts exist; KOP categories with similar impacts are grouped together.

### **Construction**

#### ***KOP Categories 1 through 6***

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar, as would construction equipment. The larger projects would involve the use of cranes and jackhammers to break concrete. Staging areas for construction equipment would be located in the right-of-way (ROW) or on appropriate vacant areas for in-channel or off-channel projects. Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 could include more complex amenities and thus would generally last longer than construction of the Typical Projects, with additional construction equipment. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 through 6 are not known, it is possible that construction activities could conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

For the same reasons listed above for Typical Projects, impacts associated with the KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be potentially significant, requiring mitigation in the form of a construction management plan. The reader is referred to the discussion under *Typical Projects, Construction*, for details.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

**Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

**Operations**

***KOP Categories 1 through 6***

Under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the multi-benefit design components can be implemented individually or in combination with other design components as subsequent projects. The specific location (in-channel/off-channel, frame, etc.) and design details of these subsequent projects would depend on numerous factors, including the project proponent, the implementing agency, community needs, policy decisions, and availability of funding. New vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian bridges will increase connectivity between neighborhoods on opposite sides of the river and will reduce the distance required to travel in order to make a crossing using the more limited number of existing, mostly vehicularly focused arterial bridges. Within the context of consistency with programs, plans, and policies, what the Typical Projects and the KOP categories have in common is that they would provide amenities, new structures, art work, and additional recreational uses and trails. Therefore, for the same reasons as described under *Typical Projects, Operations*, above, impacts associated with operations of KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be less than significant.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation

As described in the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, approximately 107 projects ranging in size from extra-small (less than 1 acre) to extra-large (150+ acres/10+ miles) would be implemented over the 25-year horizon period to meet the Project's nine objectives. These would include the Typical Projects that would be implemented in specific spacing along the river, and subsequent projects composed of the KOP categories' multi-benefit design components. These elements together comprise the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, the greatest number of projects (85) anticipated under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are extra-small and small projects (up to 3 acres), followed by 10 medium projects (3 to 40 acres/5 miles in size), 11 large projects (40 to 150 acres/10 miles in size), and 1 extra-large project (150+ acres/10+ miles in size).

### **Construction**

The discussion of construction impacts for overall implementation would be the same as for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved (e.g., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, generators, etc.). As noted, some projects would be larger than others and include a wide variety of project design components. While the specific details of the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation are not known, traffic and circulation impacts are not expected to be of a magnitude such that they would result in a conflict with any programs, plans, or policies addressing the circulation system, or transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. However, there could be intermittent lane and sidewalk closures during construction, which could impede circulation. These impacts have the potential to be significant.

Therefore, construction impacts would be potentially significant for the same reasons as described under *Typical Projects, Construction, and KOP Categories 1 through 6, Construction*, above.

### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

### **Operations**

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would provide gateways, amenities, new structures, art work, and additional recreational uses, and trails. Under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the multi-benefit design components can be implemented individually or in combination with other design components as subsequent projects. The specific location (in-channel/off-channel, frame, etc.) and

design details of these subsequent projects would depend on numerous factors, including the project proponent, the implementing agency, community needs, policy decisions, and availability of funding. As described above for Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, within the context of consistency with programs, plans, and policies, what all subsequent projects have in common is that they would provide amenities, new structures, art work, and additional recreational uses and trails. Therefore, for the same reasons as described under *Typical Projects, Operations* and *KOP Categories 1 through 6, Operations*, above, operation impacts associated with implementation of the 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be less than significant.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

### **Impact 3.16(b): Would the proposed Project conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

For the purposes of this PEIR, more detail is provided for the Common Elements and the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects. However, for the purposes of the transportation analysis, two critical pieces of detail regarding the Typical Projects are still unknown: specific project location of the Typical Projects and square footage of individual elements in the Common Elements Typical Project. Without these pieces of information, trip generation estimates and user vehicle trip lengths for the Typical Projects cannot be developed and cannot be evaluated quantitatively. Thus, the Typical Projects have been evaluated qualitatively in this analysis, as is allowed under CEQA Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(3).

The KOP Categories and the Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation also have been evaluated qualitatively, using the same approach developed to analyze the Typical Projects. The qualitative analysis allows for the identification of the potential to result in a significant impact, but not for the identification of a significant impact itself, which can only be determined when subsequent project location and programming (function/use, size, capacity etc.) specifics are known and after quantitative analysis has been undertaken. Given the wide range of individual project elements, including land use projects, transportation projects, and other infrastructure projects that are neither land use nor transportation projects, such as trail lighting or a terraced river bank, that together form the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, each project element was evaluated individually for its potential to generate VMT and to result in a significant VMT impact. The two Typical Projects were evaluated for their collective potential as a grouping of a specific set of elements to generate VMT and to result in a significant transportation impact, based on whether any of their individual elements were identified as having that potential (Appendix I, *Transportation Impact Assessment*).

The following screening checklist from the Guidelines, developed by the County based on the OPR technical advisory for use in transportation impact analysis, was reviewed to help evaluate whether the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1) by causing substantial increases in vehicle miles traveled:

For land use projects:

- Non-Retail Project Trip Generation: Would the land use project generate a net increase of 110 or more daily trips? [Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Section 3.1.2.1]
- Retail Project Site Plan: Would the project contain retail uses that exceed a net 50,000 square feet of gross floor area? [Section 3.1.2.2]
- Location-based: Would the project be located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor? [Section 3.1.2.3]
  - This screening criteria has not been considered in this VMT impact evaluation. Locations of major transit stops or high-quality transit corridors may change over the 25-year buildout timeframe for the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. When specific locations for subsequent projects sites have been selected, applicability of this screening criteria should be considered based on adjacency to transit stops and corridors existing at that time. Transit accessibility is recommended as a specific criterion in site selection to ensure maximum accessibility via non-private vehicle modes.
- Residential: Would the project consist of 100% affordable housing? [Section 3.1.2.4]

For transportation projects:

- Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)? [Section 3.2.1]
- Would the project include the addition of through-traffic lanes on existing or new highways, including general purpose lanes, high-occupancy vehicle lanes, peak period lanes, auxiliary lanes, and lanes through grade-separated interchanges (except managed lanes, transit lanes, and auxiliary lanes of less than one mile in length designed to improve roadway safety)? [Section 3.2.2]

Depending on the answer to each of the screening checklist questions above for each project element/design component individually and the two Typical Projects as a whole, a less-than-significant impact or potentially significant impact determination for VMT impacts could be made based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(1) and (b)(2). For projects determined to have a less-than-significant impact on VMT based upon the screening criteria, no further transportation impact analysis, including VMT analysis, is required when they are implemented as individual subsequent projects in the future. For those projects elements or Typical Projects for which the screening criteria do not automatically identify a less-than-significant impact on VMT, all that can be known at this time is that that project element/design component or Typical Project has the potential to result in a significant VMT impact, not that it definitively does. Quantitative VMT impact analysis will be required for projects that include those elements in the future when the specific locations of subsequent projects, and their configurations, size, and other project details are developed.

## Impact Criteria

The County's VMT impact criteria were developed based on guidance from OPR and CARB. Per the criteria, project VMT impact thresholds as described in the County Guidelines vary depending on the project type, as follows:

- For residential development land use projects, the project would generate residential VMT<sup>4</sup> per capita exceeding 16.8% below the existing<sup>5</sup> residential VMT per capita for the Baseline Area in which the project is located.
- For office land use projects, the project would generate employment VMT<sup>6</sup> per employee exceeding 16.8% below the existing<sup>5</sup> (employment VMT per employee for the Baseline Area in which the project is located).
- For regional serving retail land use projects, entertainment projects, and/or event center land uses, the project would result in a net increase in existing Total VMT.<sup>7</sup> Trips associated with these land uses are typically discretionary trips, which may be either substitute trips to other, closer destinations, or new trips entirely. A project-specific customized approach will be required to estimate VMT for such projects. The methodology should be developed in consultation with and approved by Public Works staff at the outset of the study.
- For unique land uses in which a land use project does not fit into any of the above categories, a project-specific customized approach may be required to estimate daily trips and VMT, but may be based on the existing employment trip element using an approach similar to that for office projects, above. The methodology and thresholds to be used in such cases should be developed in consultation with and approved by Public Works staff at the outset of the study.
- For transportation projects, a VMT impact will be found if the project will increase the study area VMT, as measurable by the SCAG RTP/SCS base year Travel Demand Forecasting model plus an induced travel elasticity factor per lane mile. Transit and active transportation projects and projects that reduce roadway capacity generally also reduce VMT and are therefore presumed to cause a less-than-significant impact.

The impact criteria are not applicable at a qualitative level of evaluation, but are presented here for informational purposes as they will be applicable for any quantitative transportation impact evaluation required in the future for project elements or Typical Projects not screened from VMT analysis, as described above, when project site-specific locations and other relevant information are known. Depending on their location, some project sites will be wholly under County control, while others will be wholly or partly under the control of other local agencies that may choose to utilize their own local transportation impact analysis criteria to evaluate the potential for project impacts.

## Typical Projects

### Common Elements

#### **Construction**

Per County Guidelines, construction impacts, if they occur, can be discussed on a qualitative basis. Construction of the Common Elements Typical Project may result in short-term increases in VMT. To

---

<sup>4</sup> Residential VMT is the VMT generated by Home-Based Work and Home-Based Other trip productions.

<sup>5</sup> As referenced by the VMT reduction goals discussed in the California ARB's *2017 Scoping Plan-Identified VMT Reductions and Relationship to State Goals*, January 2019, Figure 3.

<sup>6</sup> Employment VMT is the VMT generated by Home-Based Work trip attractions.

<sup>7</sup> As referenced by the VMT reduction goals discussed in OPR's *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*, December 2018.



account for potential impacts to traffic circulation, transportation impacts related to construction activities for the Common Elements Typical Project would be considered potentially significant.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

#### **Operations**

The results of the project VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-2 for the Common Elements Typical Projects. As shown in Table 3.16-2, the majority of the Common Elements design components, such as an access ramp, stairs, and site furnishings (e.g., a bench, hygiene facilities and restrooms, trash and recycling, drinking fountains, guard rail, emergency call box, bike rack, environmental graphics, lighting, plantings, fences and gates, and stormwater Best Management Practices) are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, two design components of the Common Elements Typical Projects are not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact:

- Tier III Pavilions – Tier III pavilions are anticipated to accommodate up to 500 visitors per day. Maximum visitation based on a conservative assumption that each visitor drove to the site alone would result in 1,000 daily vehicle trips, exceeding the screening criteria of 110 net daily trips. Many pavilion visitors would arrive to the project site via foot or bicycle, and many would be pass-by visitors stopping on their way along the LA River Trail. Once specific sites have been determined, an appropriate mode split can be identified to determine what percentage of visitors would arrive via vehicle, bicycle, foot, or transit. Local transportation characteristics and other databases can be utilized to determine an appropriate average vehicle occupancy to further refine estimates as to the number of daily vehicle trips to the site.
- Art/Performance Spaces – The scale of performances programmed for the art/performance spaces is estimated to be small and local. However, maximum daily visitation could reach 500 visitors, which could result in a significant VMT impact.

The café design component is unique amongst the Common Element Typical Projects in that it has been screened from the VMT analysis requirement but has nevertheless been identified as potentially VMT generating in Table 3.16-2 based on the nature of the design component. However, the café would have a less-than-significant VMT impact because it meets the County Guidelines screening criteria set forth in Sections 3.1.2.1 (generates less than 110 net daily trips) and 3.1.2.2 (retail use with a gross floor area of less than 50,000 square feet).

**Table 3.16-2. Typical Projects – VMT Impact Evaluation Matrix**

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Common Element or Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
<b>Pavilion – Tier III</b>	<b>Common Element</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not screened out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Café	Common Element	Land Use	Yes	Land Use	Yes	No	No
<b>Art/Performance Space</b>	<b>Common Element</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not screened out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Access Stairs	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Ramps	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Benches	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Hygiene Facilities and Restrooms	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Trash and Recycling	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Drinking Fountains	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Guard Rail	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Emergency Call Box	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Bike Rack	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Environmental Graphics	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Lighting	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Common Element or Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
Site Furnishings – Plantings	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Site Furnishings – Fences and Gates	Common Element	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Stormwater Best Management Practices	Common Element	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
<b>Common Elements Typical Project (inclusive of all Common Elements)</b>	<b>Common Element</b>		<b>No</b>	<b>Not screened out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
River Gateway	Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Pedestrian Trail	Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Bike Trail	Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Equestrian Trail	Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Multi-Use Trail	Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
<b>Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (inclusive of all Trails and Access Gateways Elements)</b>	<b>Trails and Access Gateways</b>		<b>Yes</b>	Transportation	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

<sup>1</sup> Screening Criteria:

- LU 3.1.2.1 – Generation of 110 or more net daily trips
- LU 3.1.2.2 – Retail uses with gross floor area > 50,000 square feet.
- LU 3.1.2.3 – Adjacency to transit
- LU 3.1.2.4 – 100% affordable housing
- TRANS 3.2.1 – Conflict with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)
- TRANS 3.2.2 – Addition of through-traffic lanes

### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

### *Mitigation Measures*

#### **Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

For any subsequent projects that include project elements that are identified in the VMT Impact Evaluation Matrix as having the potential to generate a significant VMT impact, the implementing agency will conduct the following two-step screening process:

- **Step 1.** Conduct a trip generation analysis to determine whether a project would generate a net increase of 110 or more daily trips, or determine whether the location is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor based on its County Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Sections 3.1.2.1 and 3.1.2.3. If the subsequent project is screened out once project design and location details are known, then no further actions are required.

If the subsequent project is not screened out after Step 1, the implementing agency will move on to Step 2.

- **Step 2.** Perform a VMT analysis for the subsequent project using the County's VMT impact criteria that have been developed based on guidance from OPR and CARB. Per the criteria, project VMT impact thresholds vary depending on the project type, as follows:
  - For residential development land use projects, the project would generate residential VMT per capita exceeding 16.8 percent below the existing residential VMT per capita for the Baseline Area in which the project is located.
  - For office land use projects, the project would generate employment VMT per employee exceeding 16.8 percent below the existing employment VMT per employee for the Baseline Area in which the project is located.
  - For regional serving retail land use projects, entertainment projects, and/or event center land uses, the project would result in a net increase in existing Total VMT. Trips associated with these land uses are typically discretionary trips, which may be either substitute trips to other, closer destinations, or new trips entirely. A project-specific customized approach will be required to estimate VMT for such projects. The methodology should be developed in consultation with and approved by Public Works staff at the outset of the study.
  - For unique land uses in which a land use project does not fit into any of the above categories, a project-specific customized approach may be required to estimate daily trips and VMT, but may be based on the existing employment trip element using an approach similar to that for office projects, above. The methodology and thresholds to be used in such cases should be developed in consultation with and approved by Public Works staff at the outset of the study.

If the subsequent project cannot be screened out but the VMT is determined to not exceed the threshold based on the applicable guideline and project type, then no further action is needed.

If the subsequent project cannot be screened out and the VMT is determined to exceed the threshold based on the applicable guideline and project type, then Mitigation Measure TRA-1b will be implemented:

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT.**

The implementing agency (County or other jurisdictional agency) will implement a subsequent project-specific program utilizing transportation demand management (TDM) strategies and neighborhood or site enhancements to reduce VMT, and any other appropriate strategies to address identified impacts and reduce VMT to the River Corridor.

The program to reduce VMT will be based on the suite of eligible TDM strategies included in the County Guidelines or other measures with substantial evidence, or, if the subsequent project is located in an incorporated city, the program will be based on that city's list of qualifying VMT mitigation strategies. Specific measures can include but are not limited to:

- Increasing transit accessibility
- Relocating a project in order to be adjacent to transit
- Pricing any provided parking at river access sites to discourage vehicle trips to the River Corridor
- Implementation of neighborhood or site enhancements such as pedestrian network improvements (for example, high-visibility crosswalks, continuous sidewalks, and Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA]-compliant directional curb cuts at intersections), and traffic calming measures such as speed humps or chicanes

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways**

***Construction***

Per County Guidelines, construction impacts, if they occur, can be discussed on a qualitative basis. Construction of a Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project may result in short-term impacts related to increases in VMT. Thus, any transportation impacts related to construction activities for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would be potentially significant.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

**Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

**Operations**

The results of the VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-2 for Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects. Table 3.16-2 shows that, unlike Common Elements projects, all of the components are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact because they would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

**2020 LA River Master Plan Kit of Parts**

The Common Elements Typical Project analyzed above could be implemented in whole or as a combination of its individual elements with all the KOP categories discussed below. Therefore, for potential impacts of Common Elements, see above. The impact discussion below focuses on specific KOP categories only.

The design components analyzed in this section include those listed in Chapter 2, *Project Description*. Each KOP is analyzed separately where differences in impacts exist; KOP categories with similar impacts are grouped together.

**Construction*****KOP Categories 1 through 6***

Per County Guidelines, construction impacts, if they occur, can be discussed on a qualitative basis. Construction of subsequent projects under the six KOP categories may result in short-term impacts related to increases in VMT. Thus, any transportation impacts related to construction activities for any of the KOP Categories would be potentially significant.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

**Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

## **Operation**

### ***KOP Category 1***

Certain design components of the Trails and Access Gateways KOP inform the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project analyzed previously. Therefore, for potential construction and operation impacts of these design components, see above. The design components analyzed in this section include those listed in Section 2.5.

KOP Category 1 projects could include a variety of recreational uses, such as equestrian facilities and trails, light towers, water towers, lookouts, boardwalks, channel access points, vehicular access for maintenance and operations, underpasses and overpasses, and habitat corridors. The results of the project VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-3 for KOP Category 1. Table 3.16-3 shows that all of the components associated with KOP Category 1 except for the equestrian facility are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact because they would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) for the same reason as described under *Typical Projects* above.

KOP Category 1 design components that are screened out from required VMT analysis and that have been identified in Table 3.16-3 as not having the potential to generate VMT would result in a less-than-significant impact as they would not generate VMT and thus would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b); these include: light tower/water tower, lookout, boardwalk, channel access, vehicular access, underpass/overpass, vegetated buffer, and habitat corridor.

Certain KOP Category 1 design components have been screened from required VMT analysis but have been identified as potentially VMT generating in Table 3.16-3 based on the nature of the design component; these include river gateway, pedestrian trail, bike trail, equestrian trails, and multi-use trails. However, these design components would have a less-than-significant VMT impact because they meet the County Guidelines screening criteria set forth in Section 3.2.1 (i.e., they would not conflict with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(2) because they would reduce VMT by providing an active transportation option or they would not have an impact on VMT) or Section 3.2.2 (i.e., they would not include the addition of through-traffic lanes). Thus, implementation of these design components would not conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b).

Table 3.16-3 shows the equestrian facility design component as having the potential to generate a significant VMT impact. Programming and size of facility details would be required to determine the potential for significant VMT impacts. For example, a small equestrian facility to serve neighborhood residents and/or equestrians already on the trail would generate fewer trips than a top regional facility. Not only would a local-serving facility attract fewer equestrians, but many may walk to a facility within their own neighborhood as opposed to driving to one farther away. Thus, implementation of this design component could conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), which would be a significant impact.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.



**Table 3.16-3. Kit of Parts Components – VMT Impact Evaluation Matrix**

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
River Gateway	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Pedestrian Trail	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Bike Trail	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Equestrian Trail	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
<b>Equestrian Facility</b>	<b>KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Screened Out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Multi-Use Trail	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Light Tower/Water Tower	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Lookout	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	No	No	No
Boardwalk	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	No	No	No
Channel Access	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	No	No	No
Vehicular Access	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	No	No	No
Underpass/Overpass	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	No	No	No
Vegetated Buffer	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
Habitat Corridor	KOP 1: Trails and Access Gateways	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
<b>Terraced Bank</b>	<b>KOP 2: Channel Modifications</b>	<b>Other (water management)</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Screened Out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Check Dam	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Levee	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Armored Channel	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Storm Drain Daylighting	KOP 2: Channel Modifications Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Vertical Wall	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Channel Smoothing	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Texturizing or Grooving	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Concrete Bottom	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Soft Bottom/Concrete Removal	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Sediment Removal	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Bridge Pier Modification	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
Access Ramp	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Reshape Low Flow	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Deployable Barrier	KOP 2: Channel Modifications	Other (water management)	Yes	Not Applicable	No	No	No
Pedestrian Bridge	KOP 3: Crossings and Platforms	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Bike Bridge	KOP 3: Crossings and Platforms	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Equestrian Bridge	KOP 3: Crossings and Platforms	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Multi-Use Bridge	KOP 3: Crossings and Platforms	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	Yes	No	No
Cantilever	KOP 3: Crossings and Platforms	Transportation	Yes	Transportation	No	No	No
<b>Platform</b>	<b>KOP 3: Crossings and Platforms</b>	<b>Transportation</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Screened Out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Diversion Pipe	KOP 4: Diversions	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
<b>Side Channel</b>	<b>KOP 4: Diversions KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation</b>	<b>Other (water management)</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Screened Out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Diversion Channel	KOP 4: Diversions	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Pump	KOP 4: Diversions	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Diversion Tunnel	KOP 4: Diversions	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
Overflow Weir	KOP 4: Diversions	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Underground Gallery	KOP 4: Diversions	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Wetland (In-Channel)	KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Wetland (Off-Channel)	KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Naturalized Bank	KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Braided Channel	KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
<b>Field</b>	<b>KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not screened out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Recreation Field</b>	<b>KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not screened out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Urban Agriculture/Composting</b>	<b>KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not screened out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Solar Power	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (infrastructure)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Natural Treatment System	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No

<b>Design Component</b>	<b>Kit of Parts Category</b>	<b>Project Type Transportation/Land Use/Other</b>	<b>Screened Out?</b>	<b>Applicable Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Potentially VMT Generating?</b>	<b>Potential to Result in a Significant VMT Impact?</b>	<b>Further Transportation Impact Analysis Required?</b>
Surface Storage	KOP 5: Floodplain Reclamation KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Subsurface Storage	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Injection Well	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Water Treatment Facility	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Purple Pipe Connection	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Dry Well	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Spreading Ground	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Other (water management)	Yes	Not applicable	No	No	No
Affordable Housing <sup>2</sup>	KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets	Land Use	Yes	Land Use	No	No	No
<b>Art and Culture Facility</b>	<b>KOP 6: Off-Channel Land Assets</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not Screened Out</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<sup>1</sup> Screening Criteria:

- LU 3.1.2.1 – Generation of 110 or more net daily trips
- LU 3.1.2.2 – Retail uses with gross floor area > 50,000 sf.
- LU 3.1.2.3 – Adjacency to Transit
- LU 3.1.2.4 – 100% affordable housing
- TRANS 3.2.1 – Conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)
- TRANS 3.2.2 – Addition of through-traffic lanes.

<sup>2</sup> Assumes fewer than 110 daily trips.

***KOP Category 2***

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the Channel Modifications KOP would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location, including in-channel or off-channel. The specific locations (in-channel or off-channel) and designs for these design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding.

Historically, modifications to the channel have primarily been made to increase its capacity. Depending on the channel modification implemented, benefits may include improving access and safety, making places for people and habitat, and improving channel capacity to reduce flood risk. The following design components could be constructed under KOP Category 2: terraced bank, check dams and deployable barriers, levees, armored channels/vertical walls, daylighted storm drains, removed/added concrete, bridge pier modifications, channel texturing/grooving/smoothing, and installation of access ramps. The results of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-3 for KOP Category 2. Table 3.16-3 shows that all of the components associated with KOP Category 2, except for the terraced bank design component, are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact because they would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) for the same reason as described under *Typical Projects* above. KOP Category 2 design components that are screened out from VMT analysis and have been identified in Table 3.16-3 as not having the potential to generate VMT would result in less-than-significant impacts as they would not generate VMT and thus would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); these include: check dam, levee, armored channel, storm drain daylighting, vertical wall, channel smoothing, texturizing or grooving, concrete bottom, soft bottom/concrete removal, sediment removal, bridge pier modification, access ramp, reshape low flow, and deployable barrier.

Table 3.16-3 shows that the terraced bank design component has the potential to generate a significant VMT impact. Terraced banks could serve a variety of flood management or ecological uses, none of which would result in a significant transportation impact. However, they could also be used to develop amphitheaters for public performances or parks. Site-specific details regarding site programming and acreage would be required to determine the potential for these public serving uses to be eligible for screening or to result in a VMT impact. Thus, the implementation of this design component could conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b), which would be a significant impact.

***Impact Determination***

Impacts would be potentially significant.

***Mitigation Measures***

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).**

### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

### **KOP Category 3**

KOP Category 3 includes a range of functions comprising ecological and recreational uses. Ecological uses include water features and connections for habitat communities, while recreational uses include recreational fields, parks, and channel overlooks. Operation of ecological functions would not attract a large number of users; the recreational uses under KOP Category 3 would attract additional users, and would increase the amount of recreational resources available to users in the study area.

Given its width and length, the LA River Channel can separate communities and be an obstacle for connectivity. Crossings can connect existing or proposed communities or assets on one side of the river with existing or proposed communities or assets on the other side. The following design components could be constructed under the Crossings and Platform KOP: bridges (pedestrian, bike, equestrian, habitat/wildlife, and multi-use), cantilevers, and platforms. The results of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-3 for KOP Category 3. Table 3.16-3 shows that all of the components associated with KOP Category 3, except for the platform, are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact because they would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) for the same reason as described under *Typical Projects* above.

KOP Category 3 design components that are screened out from VMT analysis and have been identified in Table 3.16-3 as not having the potential to generate VMT would result in less-than-significant impacts as they would not generate any VMT and thus would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); these include: cantilever.

Certain KOP Category 3 design components have been screened from required VMT analysis but have been identified as potentially VMT generating in Table 3.16-3 based on the nature of the design component; these include: pedestrian bridge, bike bridge, equestrian bridge, and multi-use bridge. However, these design components would have a less-than-significant VMT impact because they meet the County Guidelines screening criteria set forth in Section 3.2.1 (i.e., they would not conflict with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b)(2) because they would reduce VMT by providing an active transportation option or they would not have an impact on VMT) or Section 3.2.2 (i.e., they would not include the addition of through-traffic lanes). Thus, implementation of these design components would not conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b).

Table 3.16-3 shows that the platform design component has the potential to generate a significant VMT impact. While crossings typically will provide for transport across the river for pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians, platforms are envisioned as wider facilities providing space for parks, recreation, and wildlife habitats. Platforms could host a range of habitat typologies and would allow for wildlife migration. Such habitat-focused uses would not generate VMT beyond incidental maintenance trips, and their impacts would automatically be assumed to be less than significant. For the public-serving uses, including parks and recreation spaces, site-specific details regarding site programming and acreage would be required to determine the potential for these uses to be eligible for screening or to result in a VMT impact. Thus, the implementation of this design component could

conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b), which would be a significant impact.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**KOP Category 4**

KOP Category 4 includes a range of functions including flood management, recreational, and ecological uses such as pumps, wetlands, diversion channels, and overflow weirs.

Used for reducing flood risk and benefiting local water supply reliability, diversions also provide opportunities for treatment and reuse of water for groundwater recharge, habitat features, or recreational opportunities during smaller storm events, or in the dry season when flows are reduced. The following design components could be constructed under the Diversions KOP: pumps, diversion pipe/tunnel/channel, overflow weirs, underground gallery, side channel, storm drain interceptors, and wetlands. The results of the 2020 LA River Master Plan VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-3 for KOP Category 4. Table 3.16-3 shows that all of the components associated with KOP Category 4, except the side channel, are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in no impact or a less-than-significant impact because they would not conflict with or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) for the same reason as described under *Typical Projects* above.

KOP Category 4 design components that are screened out from VMT analysis and have been identified in Table 3.16-3 as not having the potential to generate VMT would result in less-than-significant impacts as they would not generate any VMT and thus would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); these include: the diversion pipe, diversion channel, pump, diversion tunnel, overflow weir, and underground gallery.

Table 3.16-3 shows that the side channel design component has the potential to generate a significant VMT impact. Diversions are primarily flood management measures intended to address storm event high water flows; however, during the dry season when water flows are reduced, diversion channels may also provide the setting for education programs (e.g., those focused on ecosystem function). Programming and location specifics for the educational uses would need to be provided for screening eligibility or the potential to result in a significant impact. Thus, implementation of this design component could conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b), which would be a significant impact.



***Impact Determination***

Impacts would be potentially significant.

***Mitigation Measures***

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.****Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).*****Significance after Required Mitigation***

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

***KOP Category 5***

KOP Category 5 includes a range of functions including flood management, recreational, and ecological uses such as wetlands, naturalized banks, braided channels, fields, storage, side channels, and recreational uses (e.g., boardwalk platforms and a farmers' market).

Historically, the LA River had a vast floodplain, and the river would commonly shift its course after major floods. In the 1930s, the USACE channelized the river and replaced the shifting floodplain to prevent further flooding. This ultimately allowed for future development and urbanization. Floodplain reclamation in the LA River includes wetlands, naturalized banks, braided channels, fields, storage, and side channels. The results of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* VMT impact evaluation are presented in Table 3.16-3 for the KOP Category 5 components. Table 3.16-3 shows that all of the components associated with KOP Category 5, except the field and recreational field, are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact because they would not conflict with or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) for the same reason as described under *Typical Projects* above.

KOP Category 5 design components that are screened out from VMT analysis and have been identified in Table 3.16-3 as not having the potential to generate VMT would result in less-than-significant impacts as they would not generate any VMT and thus would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); these include: wetland (in-channel), wetland (off-channel), naturalized bank, and braided channel.

Table 3.16-3 shows that the following design components have the potential to generate a significant VMT impact:

- Fields – May include play fields, farmers' markets, or other uses. When more refined programmatic and acreage information is available based on a site-specific project configuration, daily trip generation estimates can be developed to determine the potential for VMT screening or impacts.
- Recreation Fields – Programming and size of facility details will be required to determine the potential for significant VMT impacts. For example, recreation fields with four individual soccer fields supporting regional tournaments will have a very different trip generation, mode split, and trip length profile from a neighborhood park with one softball diamond.

For these two public-serving uses, site-specific details regarding site programming, configuration, and facility size details would be required to determine the potential for these uses to be eligible for screening or to result in a VMT impact. Thus, the implementation of this design component could conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b), which would be a significant impact.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

#### **Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

#### **Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### ***KOP Category 6***

Based on the limitations on what can be located within the LA River ROW, off-channel land assets can be used for projects that are essential to the *2020 LA River Master Plan* but cannot be located in the channel or adjacent ROW. Off-channel land assets combined with ROW improvements can further ensure projects are multi-benefit, addressing multiple needs. Off-channel land assets include affordable housing, cultural centers, urban agriculture/composting, water storage, water treatment facilities, dry wells, spreading grounds, purple pipe connections, storm drain daylighting, injection wells, solar panels, fields, and parks.

KOP Category 6 design components that are screened out from VMT analysis and have been identified in Table 3.16-3 as not having the potential to generate VMT would result in less-than-significant impacts as they would not generate any VMT and thus would not conflict with nor be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). These include: solar power, natural treatment system, surface storage, subsurface storage, injection well, water treatment facility, purple pipe connection, dry well, spreading ground, and affordable housing.<sup>8</sup>

Table 3.16-3 shows that the following design components have the potential to generate a significant VMT impact:

- Recreation Fields – Programming and size of facility details will be required to determine the potential for significant VMT impacts. For example, recreation fields with four individual soccer fields supporting regional tournaments will have a very different trip generation, mode split, and trip length profile from a neighborhood park with one softball diamond.

---

<sup>8</sup> Development of affordable housing under KOP 6 would encourage a mix of supportive housing, affordable rental, and affordable homeownership units in both new construction and preservation buildings, which is designed to increase affordable housing in the area rather than create new housing for people outside of the County.

- Urban Agriculture/Composting – Urban agriculture may include community gardens and compost facilities or plant nurseries. More refined programmatic, size, and location information will be required to determine the potential to result in a VMT impact.
- Art and Culture Facilities – Arts and culture facilities could include museums, galleries, libraries, or other public facilities. More refined programmatic and size information will be required to determine the potential to result in a VMT impact.

As discussed above, and shown in Table 3.16-3, the three specific components—recreational fields, urban agriculture/composting, and art and culture facilities—were not screened out of the VMT analysis and were subsequently determined to be potentially VMT generating. For these three components, information regarding programming, location, and facility size would be required to determine the potential for these uses to be eligible for screening or to result in a VMT impact. Thus, the implementation of this design component could conflict with or be inconsistent with the criteria set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b), which would be a significant impact.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

#### **Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

#### **Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

### **Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation**

#### ***Construction***

Per County Guidelines, construction impacts, if they occur, can be discussed on a qualitative basis. The construction impacts associated with the 107 projects under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to those described in the KOP categories; these projects are expected to be constructed throughout the 25-year life of the Project. The same general construction equipment and activities would be involved (i.e., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, generators, etc.), and the extent and duration would vary based on overall project design and location. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known, it is possible that construction activities of the 107 projects could conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Development of subsequent projects under the 107 projects may result in short-term increases in VMT. These impacts have the potential to be significant.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

### **Operations**

Operation of the 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would include various flood management improvements, recreational facilities and amenities, habitat restoration, affordable housing, and arts and cultural facilities. These would include the Typical Projects that would be implemented along the river, and subsequent projects composed of the KOP categories' multi-benefit design components. These elements together comprise the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*.

Table 3.16-2 and Table 3.16-3 identified that the Common Elements Typical Projects, including individual common elements such as pavilions and art/performance spaces, have the potential to result in a significant impact related to VMT, as do some design components under the six KOP categories. Given the expected cadence of common elements as well as the overall number of projects that could be developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the potential exists for implementation of the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to incrementally result in a significant impact on VMT. As stated in Appendix I, each individual project's potential to result in a significant transportation impact would need to be evaluated by the project proponent when the project's exact location, configuration, and scale are known, and cannot be determined based on the current level of project specificity.

Recent County modeling efforts completed during the County's process to develop SB 743-compliant CEQA thresholds and guidelines utilized the SCAG transportation demand forecasting model to identify unique average or baseline per capita and per employee VMT for the north and south areas of the County for residential vehicle trips that start within the County or employment trips that end there, and to forecast 2040 conditions. While the horizon year of the County's modeling efforts for that project are 5 years before the 2045 horizon year for the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is likely that the long-term VMT trends identified in that effort would continue in the years between 2040 and 2045. In general, VMT on a per capita basis is projected to go down throughout the SCAG region due to increasing population and job density, infill development, and greater active transportation and transit usage. Within the study area, areas with residential VMT per capita lower than the baseline established in the County's SB 743 modeling efforts increase to almost a quarter of all land area from 10 percent today. Similarly, areas with employee VMT below the County baseline are forecast to increase from 10 percent today to almost 20 percent by 2040. This trend of decreasing VMT in general and specifically within the study area also decreases the likelihood of finding a significant impact on VMT resulting from implementation of the full *2020 LA River Master Plan* as projects are brought forth over time.

Despite the VMT trend, 11 project elements were not screened from requiring VMT analysis and were determined to be potentially VMT generating. These elements include tier III pavilions;

art/performance spaces; equestrian facilities, terraced banks, platforms, side channels, fields; recreation fields; urban agriculture/composting; and art and culture facilities. The exact locations or extent of the 107 projects that could be proposed are currently unknown, as are the Common Elements Typical Projects, and these may include any of the 11 non-screened elements. Further VMT analysis will continue to be required for any project containing one of these potentially impactful project elements. Therefore, while the likelihood of an impact arising from implementation of the full *2020 LA River Master Plan* decreases over time, the impact on VMT is determined to be potentially significant.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.**

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT (if applicable).**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impact 3.16(c)/(d): Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Typical Projects**

**Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways**

***Construction***

Construction of Common Elements or Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects may result in short-term roadway effects (e.g., localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures), which could result in increased hazards from geometric design (e.g., reduced sight lines due to temporary obstructions such as construction equipment parked in the roadway) and emergency access, both along the river (e.g., due to closed access ramps) and to adjacent land uses (e.g., due to driveways affected by lane closures).

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

### **Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

#### **Operations**

Impacts regarding the potential increase of hazards due to a geometric design feature and/or provision of inadequate emergency access that generally relates to the design of access points and/or roadway modifications to and from the Common Elements and the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects may include safety, operational, or capacity impacts. The specific locations of river access points are unknown at this time, and therefore it is also unknown whether any geometric design hazards exist that would need to be remediated, or whether design of specific access points may require modifications to existing roadway geometries. As such, the Common Elements and the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects Plan could conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. However, all access points would be required to be designed according to *2020 LA River Master Plan* Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines; as described in Chapter 2, Project Description, and included in Appendix B) applicable at the time of project development, and, where applicable, of the local agency in which they are located. Among the requirements for river access points is that they must be well-lit and provide clear lines of sight. Development of some access points may require site acquisition or easements to provide appropriate, safe access, including clear lines of sight.

To ensure safety along the river during both regular use and in periodic flood events, the Design Guidelines require that the entirety of the 51 miles of the LA River maintain emergency access for first responders and emergency personnel and vehicles, including through the provision of minimum 12-foot paved or unpaved service roads along the top of the channel in a limited landscape zone. The limited landscape zone is designed to extend 17 feet from the channel wall and prohibits any structures or obstructions. Plantings in this area are restricted to low-growing species, not to exceed 5 feet in height, to provide clear lines of sight and allow for emergency vehicle access, and would be pruned to maintain emergency access. Additionally, existing Los Angeles Flood Control District Maintenance Standards for emergency vehicle ingress and egress apply to both existing trails and future *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects.

Although some existing conditions along the river do not provide the level of access required by the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, all *2020 LA River Master Plan* development will comply with the *2020 LA River Master Plan* guidelines. Requests for variances due to ROW constraints would be reviewed and approved by the appropriate jurisdiction. Mile markers would be placed every half mile along the landside of the trail, facing both directions of travel, which allows people to easily locate themselves along the river for emergency responders.

Given the access point design standards and emergency vehicle access requirements described above, the Typical Projects would not result in inadequate emergency access during project operations.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

**KOP Categories 1 through 6*****Construction***

Under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the multi-benefit design components of the KOP categories can be implemented individually or in combination with other design components as subsequent projects. Potential impacts from construction of the design components under KOP Category 1 through KOP Category 6 would vary depending on the specific location (in-channel/off-channel, frame, etc.), configuration, design component, and its intended function. Projects under the KOP categories would likely be larger than Typical Projects.

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOP categories may result in short-term roadway effects, for example localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures, which could result in increased hazards from geometric design (e.g., reduced sight lines due to temporary obstructions such as construction equipment parked in the roadway) and emergency access, both along the river (e.g., due to closed access ramps) and to adjacent land uses (e.g., due to driveways affected by lane closures).

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

**Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.***Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

***Operations***

Similar to the Typical Projects, impacts related to a potential increase of hazards due to a geometric design feature and/or provision of inadequate emergency access that generally relates to the design of access points and/or roadway modifications to and from the KOP categories may include safety, operational, or capacity impacts. For example, alteration to existing or design of new service roads providing access for maintenance and emergency vehicles must meet with County approval or the relevant local agency's approval. Service road access from arterial streets must allow for a 20-foot

setback of vehicular access gates where feasible and must provide a 40-foot centerline turning radius for truck ingress and egress. Given the access point design standards and emergency vehicle access requirements of the Design Guidelines, the KOP categories would not result in inadequate emergency access during project operations.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## **Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation**

### ***Construction***

Although the specific timing and duration of construction of the 107 projects of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* over the 25-year project period is not known, some overlap of these projects is likely to occur. Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of all 107 projects of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* over 25 years may result in short-term roadway effects, for example localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures, which could result in increased hazards from geometric design (e.g., reduced sight lines due to temporary obstructions such as construction equipment parked in the roadway) and emergency access, both along the river (e.g., due to closed access ramps) and to adjacent land uses (e.g., due to driveways affected by lane closures).

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described in Section 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*.

**Mitigation Measure LU-1: Prepare and Implement Construction Management Plan.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant for later activities when carried out by the County.

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County.

### ***Operations***

Impacts regarding the potential increase of hazards due to a geometric design feature and/or provision of inadequate emergency access that generally relates to the design of access points and/or roadway modifications to and from all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* facilities may include safety, operational, or capacity impacts. River access points will be placed approximately every half mile. The specific locations of these river access points are unknown at this



time, and therefore it is also unknown whether any geometric design hazards exist that would need to be remediated, or whether design of specific access points may require modifications to existing roadway geometries. However, similar to the Typical Projects discussion above, all access points would be required to be designed according to the Design Guidelines, and, where applicable, and to the local agency's guidelines in which they are located. Further, alterations to existing, or design of new, service roads providing access for maintenance and emergency vehicles must meet with County approval or the relevant local agency's approval. Given the access point design standards and emergency vehicle access requirements described in detail for Typical Projects, which would apply to all subsequent projects, implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not substantially increase hazards or conflicts or result in inadequate emergency access. Furthermore, implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would remediate or improve existing substandard conditions and would therefore contribute to overall safety improvements along the entire river corridor.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be less than significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative transportation impacts is the greater Los Angeles region to encompass the entire roadway/freeway system that could be affected by cumulative projects. A description of the regulatory setting and approach to cumulative impacts analysis is provided in Section 3.0.2.

### **Criteria for Determining Significance of Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed Project would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on transportation/traffic, if, in combination with other projects within the greater Los Angeles region, it would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b); substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or result in inadequate emergency access.

### **Cumulative Condition**

Past projects in Los Angeles County (cities and unincorporated areas) have converted undeveloped and agricultural land to urban uses, resulting in residential and employment population increases and associated demand for expansions of roadway systems. The cumulative traffic impact of the County's and individual jurisdictions' general plan build-out will be largely mitigated through a combination of regional programs that are the responsibility of agencies such as cities and Caltrans.

The 2020 RTP/SCS, in addition to other projects from other regional plans (e.g., RTPs of adjacent jurisdictions), could result in additional impacts in the greater Los Angeles and SCAG regions. Recent

County modeling efforts completed during the County process to develop SB 743-compliant CEQA thresholds and guidelines utilized the SCAG transportation demand forecasting model to forecast 2040 conditions. While the horizon year of the County's modeling efforts for that project is 5 years before the 2045 horizon year for the proposed Project, it is likely that the long-term VMT trends identified in that effort would continue in the years between 2040 and 2045. In general, VMT on a per capita basis is projected to go down throughout the SCAG region due to increasing population and job density, infill development, and greater active transportation and transit usage. Within the study area, the percent of land area with residential VMT below the County baseline is forecast to increase from 10 percent today to 24 percent in 2040, with the percentage within some river frames increasing by almost 30 percent, and no frames experiencing a decrease in the percentage of land area with residential VMT below the County baseline. Similarly, percentage of total land area with employee VMT below the County baseline is forecast to increase between 2020 and 2040 by 10 percent, from 8 percent today to 18 percent in the future, with no frames experiencing a decrease in percent land area with employee VMT below the County baseline and one frame experiencing an increase of more than 25 percent in the percentage of land area that meets this metric. Table 3.16-4 presents the change in percent land area with residential and employee VMT below the County baseline by river frame and for the study area overall. Based on this information, there would be no cumulative condition with respect to transportation.

**Table 3.16-4. Percent Change in Land Area with VMT Below the County Baseline**

River Frame ID	Name	Residential VMT Below the County Baseline			Employee VMT Below the County Baseline		
		% Land Area			% Land Area		
		2020	2040 <sup>1</sup>	% Change	2020	2040 <sup>1</sup>	% Change
1	Estuary	6%	6%	0%	3%	7%	3%
2	South Plain	3%	8%	6%	6%	10%	4%
3	Central Plain	5%	5%	0%	3%	8%	5%
4	North Plain	36%	65%	29%	11%	26%	15%
5	Heights	23%	43%	21%	3%	9%	5%
6	Narrows	2%	28%	27%	2%	29%	27%
7	East Valley	6%	14%	9%	0%	11%	11%
8	Mid Valley	11%	12%	1%	1%	13%	12%
9	West Valley	9%	33%	25%	33%	33%	0%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>10%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Data based on modeling done to support development of County SB 743 Guidelines. Model horizon year for that project was 2040; the 2020 LA River Master Plan horizon year is 2045.

### Contribution of the Project to Cumulative Impacts

As noted implementation of the 2020 LA River Master Plan will allow for an increased share of trips to be completed via active transportation instead of by private vehicle. Mitigation Measures LU-1, TRA-1a, and TRA-1b would reduce all potential impacts of the proposed Project to less than significant. As there is no cumulative condition with respect to transportation, the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to transportation impacts.