Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor

Draft EIS/EIR Appendix DD
Final Growth-Inducing Impact Analysis Report

Metro

WEST SANTA ANA BRANCH TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Draft EIS/EIR Appendix DD Final Growth-Inducing Impact Analysis Report

Prepared for:

Metro

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Prepared by:

WSP USA
444 South Flower Street
Suite 800
Los Angeles, California 90071

taha
environmental planners

June 2021

AUTHORS

Terry A. Hayes, TAHA

Allyson Dong, TAHA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

Figures

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AA	Alternatives Analysis
CA HSR	California High Speed Rail
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIS/EIR	Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact
I-	Interstate Freeway
LA	Los Angeles
LAUS	Los Angeles Union Station
LRT	LRT
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
LRV	Light rail vehicle
Metro	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
MSF	Maintenance and Storage Facility
MWD	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOP	Notice of Preparation
PEROW	Pacific Electric Right-of-Way
ROW	right-of-way
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
TAZ	Transportation Analysis Zone
TOD	Transit-Oriented Development
TPSS	traction power substation
UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad
USC	United States Code
WSAB	West Santa Ana Branch

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Study Background

The West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) Transit Corridor (Project) is a proposed light rail transit (LRT) line that would extend from four possible northern termini in southeast Los Angeles (LA) County to a southern terminus in the City of Artesia, traversing densely populated, low-income, and heavily transit-dependent communities. The Project would provide reliable, fixed guideway transit service that would increase mobility and connectivity for historically underserved, transit-dependent, and environmental justice communities; reduce travel times on local and regional transportation networks; and accommodate substantial future employment and population growth.

1.2 Alternatives Evaluation, Screening and Selection Process

A wide range of potential alternatives have been considered and screened through the alternatives analysis processes. In March 2010, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) initiated the Pacific Electric Right-of-Way (PEROW)/WSAB Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study (SCAG 2013) in coordination with the relevant cities, Orangeline Development Authority (now known as Eco-Rapid Transit), the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), the Orange County Transportation Authority, and the owners of the right-of-way (ROW)—Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), BNSF Railway, and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The AA Study evaluated a wide variety of transit connections and modes for a broader 34-mile corridor from Union Station in downtown Los Angeles to the City of Santa Ana in Orange County. In February 2013, SCAG completed the PEROW/WSAB Corridor Alternatives Analysis Report[1] and recommended two LRT alternatives for further study: West Bank 3 and the East Bank.

Following completion of the AA, Metro completed the WSAB Technical Refinement Study in 2015 focusing on the design and feasibility of five key issue areas along the 19-mile portion of the WSAB Transit Corridor within LA County:

- Access to Union Station in downtown Los Angeles
- Northern Section Options
- Huntington Park Alignment and Stations
- New Metro C (Green) Line Station
- Southern Terminus at Pioneer Station in Artesia

In September 2016, Metro initiated the WSAB Transit Corridor Environmental Study with the goal of obtaining environmental clearance of the Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

[1] Initial concepts evaluated in the SCAG report included transit connections and modes for the 34-mile corridor from Union Station in downtown Los Angeles to the City of Santa Ana. Modes included low speed magnetic levitation (maglev) heavy rail, light rail, and bus rapid transit (BRT).

Metro issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on May 25, 2017, with a revised NOP issued on June 14, 2017, extending the comment period. In June 2017, Metro held public scoping meetings in the Cities of Bellflower, Los Angeles, South Gate, and Huntington Park. Metro provided Project updates and information to stakeholders with the intent to receive comments and questions through a comment period that ended in August 2017. A total of 1,122 comments were received during the public scoping period from May through August 2017. The comments focused on concerns regarding the Northern Alignment options, with specific concerns related to potential impacts to Alameda Street with an aerial alignment. Given potential visual and construction issues raised through public scoping, additional Northern Alignment concepts were evaluated.

In February 2018, the Metro Board of Directors approved further study of the alignment in the Northern Section due to community input during the 2017 scoping meetings. A second alternatives screening process was initiated to evaluate the original four Northern Alignment options and four new Northern Alignment concepts. The *Final Northern Alignment Alternatives and Concepts Updated Screening Report* was completed in May 2018 (Metro 2018a). The alternatives were further refined and, based on the findings of the second screening analysis and the input gathered from the public outreach meetings, the Metro Board of Directors approved Build Alternatives E and G for further evaluation (now referred to as Alternatives 1 and 2, respectively, in this report).

On July 11, 2018, Metro issued a revised and recirculated CEQA Notice of Preparation, thereby initiating a scoping comment period. The purpose of the revised Notice of Preparation was to inform the public of the Metro Board's decision to carry forward Alternatives 1 and 2 into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). During the scoping period, one agency and three public scoping meetings were held in the Cities of Los Angeles, Cudahy, and Bellflower. The meetings provided Project updates and information to stakeholders with the intent to receive comments and questions to support the environmental process. The comment period for scoping ended in August 24, 2018; over 250 comments were received.

Following the July 2018 scoping period, a number of Project refinements were made to address comments received, including additional grade separations, removing certain stations with low ridership, and removing the Bloomfield extension option. The Metro Board adopted these refinements to the project description at their November 2018 meeting.

1.3 Report Purpose and Structure

This Impact Analysis Report analyzes the potential for growth-inducing impacts that would occur from the Build Alternatives. The report is organized into eight sections:

- Section 1 – Introduction
- Section 2 – Project Description
- Section 3 – Regulatory Framework
- Section 4 – Affected Environment / Existing Conditions
- Section 5 – Environmental Consequences / Environmental Impacts
- Section 6 – California Environmental Quality Act Determination
- Section 7– Project Measures and Mitigation Measures
- Section 8 – References

1.4 General Background

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) develops, refines and maintains SCAG's regional and small area socio-economic forecasting/allocation models. The socio-economic estimates and projections are used for federal and state mandated long-range planning efforts such as the SCAG 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS presents the transportation and overall land use vision for the six-county SCAG region. It is a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals. The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS plans for focusing new growth around transit.

SCAG regional growth forecast represents the most likely growth scenario for the southern California region in the future and takes into consideration recent and past trends, key technical assumptions, regional growth policies, and local plans and policies. In determining the growth forecast for the region, SCAG incorporates population, housing, and employment estimates maintained by local jurisdictions and unincorporated communities in southern California.

1.5 Methodology

1.5.1 Definition of Affected Area

The Project alignment is located through or along the boundaries of 12 local jurisdictions. Affected cities include Los Angeles, unincorporated community of Florence-Firestone of Los Angeles (LA) County, Vernon, Huntington Park, Bell, Cudahy, South Gate, Downey, Paramount, Bellflower, Cerritos and Artesia. In parallel with the analysis presented in the *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Communities and Neighborhoods Impact Analysis Report* (Metro, 2021b), the Affected Area is defined as those areas located 0.25-mile on either side of the proposed alignments, parking facilities, and maintenance and storage facility (MSF) sites, as well as 0.5-mile around the proposed station areas.

1.5.2 Data Gathering

Population, household, and employment estimates presented in this analysis is based on data from the US Census Bureau and also presented in the *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Communities and Neighborhoods Impact Analysis Report* (Metro, 2021b). The historical population, housing, and employment data are obtained from the US Department of Finance, SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Demographics & Growth Forecast, and US Census Bureau.

The Base Year 2017 and Buildout Year 2042 residential population in the Affected Area are derived from Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ)-level estimates from the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. [2, 3] Information about average household size were obtained from the US Census Bureau's block group-level 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates released in 2016. The characterization of the Affected Area was then refined based on a thorough review of local general plans, land use and zoning maps, and a desktop aerial survey of each community.

1.5.3 Analysis

As a transit infrastructure project, the Project is not anticipated to directly foster growth, but instead would accommodate SCAG and jurisdictional forecasted growth and is anticipated to redistribute the planned growth within the jurisdictions and region. SCAG regional growth forecast represents the most likely growth scenario for the southern California region in the future and takes into consideration recent and past trends, key technical assumptions, regional growth policies, and local plans and policies. The SCAG regional growth forecast is used to identify trends in population, housing, and employment and to determine if the Project would result in direct or indirect unplanned growth beyond growth already anticipated for the SCAG region. Analysis of growth inducing impacts evaluate the Build Alternatives' reasonably anticipated growth in comparison to the population, households, and employment projections developed by a federally designated metropolitan planning organization. SCAG is the federally designated metropolitan planning organization for LA County.

NEPA requires that the federal government use all practicable means to ensure that all Americans have safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4331(b)(2)). NEPA does not include specific guidance or direction with respect to evaluating alternatives and relative effects of inducing growth.

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e), the growth inducing analysis evaluates whether a project could promote economic or population growth in the vicinity of the project or remove obstacles to population growth. Generally, growth inducement may occur if a project fosters economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, beyond planned growth or otherwise lead to a degradation of environmental quality such as increased noise or air quality. Indirect or secondary effects are defined as effects caused by the project that occur later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable. CEQA Guidelines state that growth in any area should not be assumed to be necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

[2] The Base Year 2017 is determined by the year the Notice of Intent was publicly published in the Federal Register and the Notice of Preparation was published informing the public of the intent to prepare a combined Draft EIS/EIR for the Project and notifying interested agencies and parties of public scoping meetings. The Notice of Intent and Notice or Preparation were published in 2017. The Build-out Year 2042 is determined when the Project would be completed.

[3] The forecasted growth does not include a No Build Alternative scenario, but a portion of projected growth would still under the No Build Alternative.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section describes the No Build Alternative and the four Build Alternatives studied in the WSAB Transit Corridor Draft EIS/EIR, including design options, station locations, and maintenance and storage facility (MSF) site options. The Build Alternatives were developed through a comprehensive alternatives analysis process and meet the purpose and need of the Project.

The No Build Alternative and four Build Alternatives are generally defined as follows:

- **No Build Alternative** - Reflects the transportation network in the 2042 horizon year without the proposed Build Alternatives. The No Build Alternative includes the existing transportation network along with planned transportation improvements that have been committed to and identified in the constrained Metro 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (2009 LRTP) (Metro 2009) and SCAG's 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) (SCAG 2016), as well as additional projects funded by Measure M that would be completed by 2042.
- **Build Alternatives**: The Build Alternatives consist of a new LRT line that would extend from different termini in the north to the same terminus in the City of Artesia in the south. The Build Alternatives are referred to as:
  - Alternative 1: Los Angeles Union Station to Pioneer Station; the northern terminus would be located underground at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) Forecourt
  - Alternative 2: 7th Street/Metro Center to Pioneer Station; the northern terminus would be located underground at 8th Street between Figueroa Street and Flower Street near 7th Street/Metro Center Station
  - Alternative 3: Slauson/A (Blue) Line to Pioneer Station; the northern terminus would be located just north of the intersection of Long Beach Avenue and Slauson Avenue in the City of Los Angeles, connecting to the current A (Blue) Line Slauson Station
  - Alternative 4: I-105/C (Green) Line to Pioneer Station; the northern terminus would be located at I-105 in the city of South Gate, connecting to the C (Green) Line along the I-105

Two design options are under consideration for Alternative 1. Design Option 1 would locate the northern terminus station box at the LAUS Metropolitan Water District (MWD) east of LAUS and the MWD building, below the baggage area parking facility. Design Option 2 would add the Little Tokyo Station along the WSAB alignment. The Design Options are further discussed in Section 2.3.6.

Figure 2-1 presents the four Build Alternatives and the design options. In the north, Alternative 1 would terminate at LAUS and primarily follow Alameda Avenue south underground to the proposed Arts/Industrial District Station. Alternative 2 would terminate near the existing 7th Street/Metro Center Station in the Downtown Transit Core and would primarily follow 8th Street east underground to the proposed Arts/Industrial District Station.

Figure 2-1. Project Alternatives

Source: Metro, 2020

From the Arts/Industrial District Station to the southern terminus at Pioneer Station, Alternatives 1 and 2 share a common alignment. South of Olympic Boulevard, the Alternatives 1 and 2 would transition from an underground configuration to an aerial configuration, cross over the Interstate (I-) 10 freeway and then parallel the existing Metro A (Blue) Line along the Wilmington Branch ROW as it proceeds south. South of Slauson Avenue, which would serve as the northern terminus for Alternative 3, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would turn east and transition to an at-grade configuration to follow the La Habra Branch ROW along Randolph Street. At the San Pedro Subdivision ROW, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would turn southeast to follow the San Pedro Subdivision ROW and then transition to the Pacific Electric Right-of-Way (PEROW), south of the I-105 freeway. The northern terminus for Alternative 4 would be located at the I-105/C Line Station. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would then follow the PEROW to the southern terminus at the proposed Pioneer Station in Artesia. The Build Alternatives would be grade-separated where warranted, as indicated on Figure 2-2.

Figure 2-2. Project Alignment by Alignment Type

Source: Metro, 2020

2.1 Geographic Sections

The approximately 19-mile corridor is divided into two geographic sections—the Northern and Southern Sections. The boundary between the Northern and Southern Sections occurs at Florence Avenue in the City of Huntington Park.

2.1.1 Northern Section

The Northern Section includes approximately 8 miles of Alternatives 1 and 2 and 3.8 miles of Alternative 3. Alternative 4 is not within the Northern Section. The Northern Section covers the geographic area from downtown Los Angeles to Florence Avenue in the City of Huntington Park and would generally traverse the Cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, Huntington Park, and Bell, and the unincorporated Florence-Firestone community of LA County (Figure 2-3). Alternatives 1 and 2 would traverse portions of the Wilmington Branch (between approximately Martin Luther King Jr Boulevard along Long Beach Avenue to Slauson Avenue). Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would traverse portions of the La Habra Branch ROW (between Slauson Avenue along Randolph Street to Salt Lake Avenue) and San Pedro Subdivision ROW (between Randolph Street to approximately Paramount Boulevard).

Figure 2-3. Northern Section

Source: Metro, 2020

2.1.2 Southern Section

The Southern Section includes approximately 11 miles of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and includes all 6.6 miles of Alternative 4. The Southern Section covers the geographic area from south of Florence Avenue in the City of Huntington Park to the City of Artesia and would generally traverse the Cities of Huntington Park, Cudahy, South Gate, Downey, Paramount, Bellflower, Cerritos, and Artesia (Figure 2-4). In the Southern Section, all four Build Alternatives would utilize portions of the San Pedro Subdivision and the Metro-owned PEROW (between approximately Paramount Boulevard to South Street).

Figure 2-4. Southern Section

Source: Metro, 2020

2.2 No Build Alternative

For the NEPA evaluation, the No Build Alternative is evaluated in the context of the existing transportation facilities in the Transit Corridor (the Transit Corridor extends approximately 2 miles from either side of the proposed alignment) and other capital transportation improvements and/or transit and highway operational enhancements that are reasonably foreseeable. Because the No Build Alternative provides the background transportation

network, against which the Build Alternatives' impacts are identified and evaluated, the No Build Alternative does not include the Project.

The No Build Alternative reflects the transportation network in 2042 and includes the existing transportation network along with planned transportation improvements that have been committed to and identified in the constrained Metro 2009 LRTP and the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS, as well as additional projects funded by Measure M, a sales tax initiative approved by voters in November 2016. The No Build Alternative includes Measure M projects that are scheduled to be completed by 2042.

Table 2.1 lists the existing transportation network and planned improvements included as part of the No Build Alternative.

Table 2.1. No Build Alternative – Existing Transportation Network and Planned Improvements

Project	To / From	Location Relative to Transit Corridor
Rail (Existing)		
Metro Rail System (LRT and Heavy Rail Transit)	Various locations	Within Transit Corridor
Metrolink (Southern California Regional Rail Authority) System	Various locations	Within Transit Corridor
Rail (Under Construction/Planned)[1]		
Metro Westside D (Purple) Line Extension	Wilshire/Western to Westwood/VA Hospital	Outside Transit Corridor
Metro C (Green) Line Extension[2] to Torrance	96th Street Station to Torrance	Outside Transit Corridor
Metro C (Green) Line Extension	Norwalk to Expo/Crenshaw[3]	Outside Transit Corridor
Metro East-West Line/Regional Connector/Eastside Phase 2	Santa Monica to Lambert Santa Monica to Peck Road	Within Transit Corridor
Metro North-South Line/Regional Connector/Foothill Extension to Claremont Phase 2B	Long Beach to Claremont	Within Transit Corridor
Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor	Metro G (Orange) Line to Metro E (Expo) Line	Outside Transit Corridor
Metro East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor	Sylmar to Metro G (Orange) Line	Outside Transit Corridor
Los Angeles World Airport Automated People Mover	96th Street Station to LAX Terminals	Outside Transit Corridor
Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects	Various projects	Within Transit Corridor
California High-Speed Rail	Burbank to LA LA to Anaheim	Within Transit Corridor
Link US	LAUS	Within Transit Corridor

Project	To / From	Location Relative to Transit Corridor
Bus (Existing)		
Metro Bus System (including BRT, Express, and local)	Various locations	Within Transit Corridor
Municipality Bus System[4]	Various locations	Within Transit Corridor
Bus (Under Construction/Planned)		
Metro G (Orange) Line (BRT)	Del Mar (Pasadena) to Chatsworth Del Mar (Pasadena) to Canoga Canoga to Chatsworth	Outside Transit Corridor
Vermont Transit Corridor (BRT)	120th Street to Sunset Boulevard	Outside Transit Corridor
North San Fernando Valley BRT	Chatsworth to North Hollywood	Outside Transit Corridor
North Hollywood to Pasadena	North Hollywood to Pasadena	Outside Transit Corridor
Highway (Existing)		
Highway System	Various locations	Within Transit Corridor
Highway (Under Construction/Planned)		
High Desert Multi-Purpose Corridor	SR-14 to SR-18	Outside Transit Corridor
I-5 North Capacity Enhancements	SR-14 to Lake Hughes Rd	Outside Transit Corridor
SR-71 Gap Closure	I-10 to Rio Rancho Rd	Outside Transit Corridor
Sepulveda Pass Express Lane	I-10 to US-101	Outside Transit Corridor
SR-57/SR-60 Interchange Improvements	SR-70/SR-60	Outside Transit Corridor
I-710 South Corridor Project (Phase 1 & 2)	Ports of Long Beach and LA to SR-60	Within Transit Corridor
I-105 Express Lane	I-405 to I-605	Within Transit Corridor
I-5 Corridor Improvements	I-605 to I-710	Outside Transit Corridor

Source: Metro 2018, WSP 2019
Notes: [1] Where extensions are proposed for existing Metro rail lines, the origin/destination is defined for the operating scheme of the entire rail line following completion of the proposed extensions and not just the extension itself.
[2] Metro C (Green) Line extension to Torrance includes new construction from Redondo Beach to Torrance; however, the line will operate from Torrance to 96th Street.
[3] The currently under construction Metro Crenshaw/LAX Line will operate as the Metro C (Green) Line.
[4] The municipality bus network system is based on service patterns for Bellflower Bus, Cerritos on Wheels, Cudahy Area Rapid Transit, Get Around Town Express, Huntington Park Express, La Campana, Long Beach Transit, Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Norwalk Transit System and the Orange County Transportation Authority.
BRT = Bus Rapid Transit; LAUS = Los Angeles Union Station; LAX = Los Angeles International Airport; VA = Veterans Affairs

2.3 Build Alternatives

2.3.1 Proposed Alignment Configuration for the Build Alternatives

This section describes the alignment for each of the Build Alternatives. The general characteristics of the four Build Alternatives are summarized in Table 2.2. Figure 2-5 illustrates the freeway crossings along the alignment. Additionally, the Build Alternatives would require relocation of existing freight rail tracks within the ROW to maintain existing operations where there would be overlap with the proposed light rail tracks. Figure 2-6 depicts the alignment sections that would share operation with freight and the corresponding ownership.

Table 2.2. Summary of Build Alternative Components

Component	Quantity			
Alternatives	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4**
Alignment Length	19.3 miles	19.3 miles	14.8 miles	6.6 miles
Stations Configurations	11 3 aerial; 6 at-grade; 2 underground[3]	12 3 aerial; 6 at-grade; 3 underground	9 3 aerial; 6 at-grade	4 1 aerial; 3 at-grade
Parking Facilities	5 (approximately 2,780 spaces)	5 (approximately 2,780 spaces)	5 (approximately 2,780 spaces)	4 (approximately 2,180 spaces)
Length of underground, at-grade, and aerial	2.3 miles underground; 12.3 miles at-grade; 4.7 miles aerial[1]	2.3 miles underground; 12.3 miles at-grade; 4.7 miles aerial[1]	12.2 miles at-grade; 2.6 miles aerial[1]	5.6 miles at-grade; 1.0 miles aerial[1]
At-grade crossings	31	31	31	11
Freight crossings	10	10	9	2
Freeway Crossings	6 (3 freeway undercrossings[2] at I-710; I-605, SR-91)	6 (3 freeway undercrossings[2] at I-710; I-605, SR-91)	4 (3 freeway undercrossings[2] at I-710; I-605, SR-91)	3 (2 freeway undercrossings[2] at I-605, SR-91)
Elevated Street Crossings	25	25	15	7
River Crossings	3	3	3	1
TPSS Facilities	22[3]	23	17	7
Maintenance and Storage Facility site options	2	2	2	2

Source: WSP, 2020
Notes: [1] Alignment configuration measurements count retained fill embankments as at-grade.
[2] The light rail tracks crossing beneath freeway structures.
[3] Under Design Option 2 – Add Little Tokyo Station, an additional underground station and TPSS site would be added under Alternative 1

Figure 2-5. Freeway Crossings

Source: WSP, 2020

Figure 2-6. Existing Rail Right-of-Way Ownership and Relocation

Source: WSP, 2020

2.3.2 Alternative 1: Los Angeles Union Station to Pioneer Station

The total alignment length of Alternative 1 would be approximately 19.3 miles, consisting of approximately 2.3 miles of underground, 12.3 miles of at-grade, and 4.7 miles of aerial alignment. Alternative 1 would include 11 new LRT stations, 2 of which would be underground, 6 would be at-grade, and 3 would be aerial. Under Design Option 2, Alternative 1 would have 12 new LRT stations, and the Little Tokyo Station would be an additional underground station. Five of the stations would include parking facilities, providing a total of up to 2,780 new parking spaces. The alignment would include 31 at-grade crossings, 3 freeway undercrossings, 2 aerial freeway crossings, 1 underground freeway crossing, 3 river crossings, 25 aerial road crossings, and 10 freight crossings.

In the north, Alternative 1 would begin at a proposed underground station at/near LAUS either beneath the LAUS Forecourt or, under Design Option 1, east of the MWD building beneath the baggage area parking facility (Section 2.3.6). Crossovers would be located on the north and south ends of the station box with tail tracks extending approximately 1,200 feet north of the station box. A tunnel extraction portal would be located within the tail tracks for both Alternative 1 terminus station options.

From LAUS, the alignment would continue underground crossing under the US-101 freeway and the existing Metro L (Gold) Line aerial structure and continue south beneath Alameda Street to the optional Little Tokyo Station between 1st Street and 2nd Street (note: under Design Option 2, Little Tokyo Station would be constructed). From the optional Little Tokyo Station, the alignment would continue underground beneath Alameda Street to the proposed Arts/Industrial District Station under Alameda Street between 6th Street and Industrial Street. (Note, Alternative 2 would have the same alignment as Alternative 1 from this point south. Refer to Section 2.3.3 for additional information on Alternative 2.)

The underground alignment would continue south under Alameda Street to 8thth Street, where the alignment would curve to the west and transition to an aerial alignment south of Olympic Boulevard. The alignment would cross over the I-10 freeway in an aerial viaduct structure and continue south, parallel to the existing Metro A (Blue) Line at Washington Boulevard. The alignment would continue in an aerial configuration along the eastern half of Long Beach Avenue within the UPRR-owned Wilmington Branch ROW, east of the existing Metro A (Blue) Line and continue south to the proposed Slauson/A Line Station. The aerial alignment would pass over the existing pedestrian bridge at E. 53rdrd Street. The Slauson/A Line Station would serve as a transfer point to the Metro A (Blue) Line via a pedestrian bridge. The vertical circulation would be connected at street level on the north side of the station via stairs, escalators, and elevators. (The Slauson/A Line Station would serve as the northern terminus for Alternative 3; refer to Section 2.3.4 for additional information on Alternative 3.)

South of the Slauson/A Line Station, the alignment would turn east along the existing La Habra Branch ROW (also owned by UPRR) in the median of Randolph Street. The alignment would be on the north side of the La Habra Branch ROW and would require the relocation of existing freight tracks to the southern portion of the ROW. The alignment would transition to an at-grade configuration at Alameda Street and would proceed east along the Randolph Street median. Wilmington Avenue, Regent Street, Albany Street, and Rugby Avenue would be closed to traffic crossing the ROW, altering

the intersection design to a right-in, right-out configuration. The proposed Pacific/Randolph Station would be located just east of Pacific Boulevard.

From the Pacific/Randolph Station, the alignment would continue east at-grade. Rita Avenue would be closed to traffic crossing the ROW, altering the intersection design to a right-in, right-out configuration. At the San Pedro Subdivision ROW, the alignment would transition to an aerial configuration and turn south to cross over Randolph Street and the freight tracks, returning to an at-grade configuration north of Gage Avenue. The alignment would be located on the east side of the existing San Pedro Subdivision ROW freight tracks, and the existing tracks would be relocated to the west side of the ROW. The alignment would continue at-grade within the San Pedro Subdivision ROW to the proposed at-grade Florence/Salt Lake Station south of the Salt Lake Avenue/Florence Avenue intersection.

South of Florence Avenue, the alignment would extend from the proposed Florence/Salt Lake Station in the City of Huntington Park to the proposed Pioneer Station in the City of Artesia, as shown in Figure 2-4. The alignment would continue southeast from the proposed at-grade Florence/Salt Lake Station within the San Pedro Subdivision ROW, crossing Otis Avenue, Santa Ana Street, and Ardine Street at-grade. The alignment would be located on the east side of the existing San Pedro Subdivision freight tracks and the existing tracks would be relocated to the west side of the ROW. South of Ardine Street, the alignment would transition to an aerial structure to cross over the existing UPRR tracks and Atlantic Avenue. The proposed Firestone Station would be located on an aerial structure between Atlantic Avenue and Firestone Boulevard.

The alignment would then cross over Firestone Boulevard and transition back to an at-grade configuration prior to crossing Rayo Avenue at-grade. The alignment would continue south along the San Pedro Subdivision ROW, crossing Southern Avenue at-grade and continuing at-grade until it transitions to an aerial configuration to cross over the LA River. The proposed LRT bridge would be constructed next to the existing freight bridge. South of the LA River, the alignment would transition to an at-grade configuration crossing Frontage Road at-grade, then passing under the I-710 freeway through the existing box tunnel structure and then crossing Miller Way. The alignment would then return to an aerial structure to cross the Rio Hondo Channel. South of the Rio Hondo Channel, the alignment would briefly transition back to an at-grade configuration and then return to an aerial structure to cross over Imperial Highway and Garfield Avenue. South of Garfield Avenue, the alignment would transition to an at-grade configuration and serve the proposed Gardendale Station north of Gardendale Street.

From the Gardendale Station, the alignment would continue south in an at-grade configuration, crossing Gardendale Street and Main Street to connect to the proposed I-105/C Line Station, which would be located at-grade north of Century Boulevard. This station would be connected to the new infill C (Green) Line Station in the middle of the freeway via a pedestrian walkway on the new LRT bridge. The alignment would continue at-grade, crossing Century Boulevard and then over the I-105 freeway in an aerial configuration within the existing San Pedro Subdivision ROW bridge footprint. A new Metro C (Green) Line Station would be constructed in the median of the I-105 freeway. Vertical pedestrian access would be provided from the LRT bridge to the proposed I-105/C Line Station platform via stairs and elevators. To accommodate the construction of the new station platform, the existing Metro C (Green) Line tracks would be widened and, as part of the I-105 Express Lanes Project, the I-105 lanes would be reconfigured. (The I-105/C Line Station would serve

as the northern terminus for Alternative 4; refer to Section 2.3.5 for additional information on this alternative.)

South of the I-105 freeway, the alignment would continue at-grade within the San Pedro Subdivision ROW. In order to maintain freight operations and allow for freight train crossings, the alignment would transition to an aerial configuration as it turns southeast and enter the PEROW. The existing freight track would cross beneath the aerial alignment and align on the north side of the PEROW east of the San Pedro Subdivision ROW. The proposed Paramount/Rosecrans Station would be located in an aerial configuration west of Paramount Boulevard and north of Rosecrans Avenue. The existing freight track would be relocated to the east side of the alignment beneath the station viaduct.

The alignment would continue southeast in an aerial configuration over the Paramount Boulevard/Rosecrans Avenue intersection and descend to an at-grade configuration. The alignment would return to an aerial configuration to cross over Downey Avenue descending back to an at-grade configuration north of Somerset Boulevard. One of the adjacent freight storage tracks at Paramount Refinery Yard would be relocated to accommodate the new LRT tracks and maintain storage capacity. There are no active freight tracks south of the World Energy facility.

The alignment would cross Somerset Boulevard at-grade. South of Somerset Boulevard, the at-grade alignment would parallel the existing Bellflower Bike Trail that is currently aligned on the south side of the PEROW. The alignment would continue at-grade crossing Lakewood Boulevard, Clark Avenue, and Alondra Boulevard. The proposed at-grade Bellflower Station would be located west of Bellflower Boulevard.

East of Bellflower Boulevard, the Bellflower Bike Trail would be realigned to the north side of the PEROW to accommodate an existing historic building located near the southeast corner of Bellflower Boulevard and the PEROW. It would then cross back over the LRT tracks at-grade to the south side of the ROW. The LRT alignment would continue southeast within the PEROW and transition to an aerial configuration at Cornuta Avenue, crossing over Flower Street and Woodruff Avenue. The alignment would return to an at-grade configuration at Walnut Street. South of Woodruff Avenue, the Bellflower Bike Trail would be relocated to the north side of the PEROW. Continuing southeast, the LRT alignment would cross under the SR-91 freeway in an existing underpass. The alignment would cross over the San Gabriel River on a new bridge, replacing the existing abandoned freight bridge. South of the San Gabriel River, the alignment would transition back to an at-grade configuration before crossing Artesia Boulevard at-grade.

East of Artesia Boulevard the alignment would cross beneath the I-605 freeway in an existing underpass. Southeast of the underpass, the alignment would continue at-grade, crossing Studebaker Road. North of Gridley Road, the alignment would transition to an aerial configuration to cross over 183rd Street and Gridley Road. The alignment would return to an at-grade configuration at 185th Street, crossing 186th Street and 187th Street at-grade. The alignment would then pass through the proposed Pioneer Station on the north side of Pioneer Boulevard at-grade. Tail tracks accommodating layover storage for a three-car train would extend approximately 1,000 feet south from the station, crossing Pioneer Boulevard and terminating west of South Street.

2.3.3 Alternative 2: 7th Street/Metro Center to Pioneer Station

The total alignment length of Alternative 2 would be approximately 19.3 miles, consisting of approximately 2.3 miles of underground, 12.3 miles of at-grade, and 4.7 miles of aerial alignment. Alternative 2 would include 12 new LRT stations, 3 of which would be underground, 6 would be at-grade, and 3 would be aerial. Five of the stations would include parking facilities, providing a total of approximately 2,780 new parking spaces. The alignment would include 31 at-grade crossings, 3 freeway undercrossings, 2 aerial freeway crossings, 1 underground freeway crossing, 3 river crossings, 25 aerial road crossings, and 10 freight crossings.

In the north, Alternative 2 would begin at the proposed WSAB 7th Street/Metro Center Station, which would be located underground beneath 8th Street between Figueroa Street and Flower Street. A pedestrian tunnel would provide connection to the existing 7th Street/Metro Center Station. Tail tracks, including a double crossover, would extend approximately 900 feet beyond the station, ending east of the I-110 freeway. From the 7th Street/Metro Center Station, the underground alignment would proceed southeast beneath 8th Street to the South Park/Fashion District Station, which would be located west of Main Street beneath 8th Street.

From the South Park/Fashion District Station, the underground alignment would continue under 8th Street to San Pedro Street, where the alignment would turn east toward 7th Street, crossing under privately owned properties. The tunnel alignment would cross under 7th Street and then turn south at Alameda Street. The alignment would continue south beneath Alameda Street to the Arts/Industrial District Station located under Alameda Street between 7th Street and Center Street. A double crossover would be located south of the station box, south of Center Street. From this point, the alignment of Alternative 2 would follow the same alignment as Alternative 1, which is described further in Section 2.3.2.

2.3.4 Alternative 3: Slauson/A (Blue) Line to Pioneer Station

The total alignment length of Alternative 3 would be approximately 14.8 miles, consisting of approximately 12.2 miles of at-grade, and 2.6 miles of aerial alignment. Alternative 3 would include 9 new LRT stations, 6 would be at-grade and 3 would be aerial. Five of the stations would include parking facilities, providing a total of approximately 2,780 new parking spaces. The alignment would include 31 at-grade crossings, 3 freeway undercrossings, 1 aerial freeway crossing, 3 river crossings, 15 aerial road crossings, and 9 freight crossings. In the north, Alternative 3 would begin at the Slauson/A Line Station and follow the same alignment as Alternatives 1 and 2, described in Section 2.3.2.

2.3.5 Alternative 4: I-105/C (Green) Line to Pioneer Station

The total alignment length of Alternative 4 would be approximately 6.6 miles, consisting of approximately 5.6 miles of at-grade and 1.0 mile of aerial alignment. Alternative 3 would include 4 new LRT stations, 3 would be at-grade, and 1 would be aerial. Four of the stations would include parking facilities, providing a total of approximately 2,180 new parking spaces. The alignment would include 11 at-grade crossings, 2 freeway undercrossings, 1 aerial freeway crossing, 1 river crossing, 7 aerial road crossings, and 2 freight crossings. In the north, Alternative 4 would begin at the I-105/C Line Station and follow the same alignment as Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, described in Section 2.3.2.

2.3.6 Design Options

Alternative 1 includes two design options:

- **Design Option 1:** LAUS at the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) – The LAUS station box would be located east of LAUS and the MWD building, below the baggage area parking facility instead of beneath the LAUS Forecourt. Crossovers would be located on the north and south ends of the station box with tail tracks extending approximately 1,200 feet north of the station box. From LAUS, the underground alignment would cross under the US-101 freeway and the existing Metro L (Gold) Line aerial structure and continue south beneath Alameda Street to the optional Little Tokyo Station between Traction Avenue and 1st Street. The underground alignment between LAUS and the Little Tokyo Station would be located to the east of the base alignment.
- **Design Option 2:** Add the Little Tokyo Station – Under this design option, the Little Tokyo Station would be constructed as an underground station and there would be a direct connection to the Regional Connector Station in the Little Tokyo community. The alignment would proceed underground directly from LAUS to the Arts/Industrial District Station primarily beneath Alameda Street.

2.3.7 Maintenance and Storage Facility

MSFs accommodate daily servicing and cleaning, inspection and repairs, and storage of light rail vehicles (LRV). Activities may take place in the MSF throughout the day and night depending upon train schedules, workload, and the maintenance requirements.

Two MSF options are evaluated; however, only one MSF would be constructed as part of the Project. The MSF would have storage tracks, each with sufficient length to store three-car train sets and a maintenance-of-way vehicle storage. The facility would include a main shop building with administrative offices, a cleaning platform, a traction power substation (TPSS), employee parking, a vehicle wash facility, a paint and body shop, and other facilities as needed. The east and west yard leads (i.e., the tracks leading from the mainline to the facility) would have sufficient length for a three-car train set. In total, the MSF would need to accommodate approximately 80 LRVs to serve the Project's operations plan.

Two potential locations for the MSF have been identified—one in the City of Bellflower and one in the City of Paramount. These options are described further in the following sections.

2.3.8 Bellflower MSF Option

The Bellflower MSF site option is bounded by industrial facilities to the west, Somerset Boulevard and apartment complexes to the north, residential homes to the east, and the PEROW and Bellflower Bike Trail to the south. The site is approximately 21 acres in area and can accommodate up to 80 vehicles (Figure 2-7).

2.3.9 Paramount MSF Option

The Paramount MSF site option is bounded by the San Pedro Subdivision ROW on the west, Somerset Boulevard to the south, industrial and commercial uses on the east, and All American City Way to the north. The site is 22 acres and could accommodate up to 80 vehicles (Figure 2-7).

Figure 2-7. Maintenance and Storage Facility Options

Source: WSP, 2020

3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

This section identifies applicable regulations and plans related to growth.

3.1 Federal

No applicable federal plans, policies, or regulations in regard to growth.

3.2 State

No applicable state plans, policies, or regulations in regard to growth.

3.3 Regional

3.3.1 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, adopted in April 2016, presents the transportation and overall land use vision for the SCAG six-county region. It is a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals. The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS identifies priorities for transportation planning within the SCAG region, sets goals and policies, and identifies performance measures for transportation improvements to ensure that future projects are consistent with other planning goals for the area. It provides local agencies in the southern California region with information to guide them in preparing local plans and addressing local issues of regional significance.

The SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS plans for focusing new growth around transit and is supported by the following policies that in turn support the development of high-quality transit areas, livable corridors, and neighborhood mobility areas:

- Identifying regional strategic areas for infill and investment
- Structuring the Plan on centers development
- Developing "Complete Communities"
- Developing nodes on a corridor
- Planning for additional housing and jobs near transit
- Planning for changing demand in types of housing
- Continuing to protect stable, existing single-family areas
- Ensuring adequate access to open space and preservation of habitat
- Incorporating local input and feedback on future growth

3.4 Local

No applicable local plans, policies, or regulations in regard to growth.

4 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT/EXISTING CONDITIONS

The approximate 19-mile alignment would travel through or adjacent to portions of the following jurisdictions: cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, Huntington Park, Bell, Cudahy, South Gate, Downey, Paramount, Bellflower, Artesia, and Cerritos, as well as unincorporated Florence-Firestone community of LA County.

4.1 Historic Growth

4.1.1 Population and Housing

Table 4.1 shows the average growth trend from the year 2000 to 2017 for LA County and the cities that the Build Alternatives would operate through. Based on the U.S. Department of Finance estimates for 2000 and 2017, historical housing growth has remained consistent with the population growth for each city. In comparison with the population and housing growth in LA County, the population and housing growth in the City of Los Angeles was greater than at the county level. The cities of Huntington Park, Bell, and Cerritos have experienced a reduction in population and housing, which can indicate a redistribution of growth located elsewhere. The high historic average growth for the City of Vernon is an exception among the cities in the Project corridor as the city primarily consists of industrial uses with a few scattered commercial businesses and a small residential neighborhood located near the Vernon Avenue/Santa Fe Avenue intersection, towards the center of the community. Thus, the high averaged population and housing growth for the City of Vernon during this period is skewed and does not reflect similar growth at the county level or in the surrounding cities.

Table 4.1. Historic Population and Housing Growth (2000-2017)

Jurisdiction	2000 – 2017 Change					
	Population			Housing		
	2000	2017	% Growth	2000	2017	% Growth
Los Angeles County	9,519,330	10,231,271	7.5%	9,344,078	10,050,030	7.6%
Los Angeles City	3,694,742	4,021,488	8.8%	3,612,145	3,926,968	8.7%
Vernon	91	209	129.7%	91	209	129.7%
Huntington Park	61,348	59,425	-3.1%	61,167	59,170	-3.3%
Bell	36,664	36,297	-1.0%	36,126	35,718	-1.1%
Cudahy	24,208	24,328	0.5%	24,196	24,320	0.5%
South Gate	96,375	98,047	1.7%	96,234	97,959	1.8%
Downey	107,323	113,670	5.9%	105,558	112,987	7.0%
Paramount	55,266	55,909	1.2%	54,946	55,599	1.2%
Bellflower	72,878	77,466	6.3%	72,255	76,727	6.2%
Artesia	16,380	16,781	2.4%	15,808	16,168	2.3%
Cerritos	51,488	50,025	-2.8%	51,395	49,921	-2.9%

Source: US Department of Finance, 2010; US Department of Finance, 2017; TAHA, 2020

4.1.2 Employment

Table 4.2 shows the average employment trend from the year 2002 to 2015 for LA County and the cities that the Build Alternatives would operate through. Based on U.S. Census Bureau data, employment growth between 2002 and 2015 occurred in the cities of Los Angeles, Bell, Cudahy, South Gate, Paramount, and Bellflower. The cities of Vernon, Huntington Park, Downey, Artesia, and Cerritos experienced a loss of job opportunities during this time that may account for the 2007-2009 economic recession. However, the loss of job opportunities may also reflect employment growth and the shift of jobs to the surrounding or adjacent cities. Regardless of the reduction of employment, the southern California region continued to historically grow and attract job opportunities, although growth may be slower in some cities.

Table 4.2. Historic Employment Growth (2002-2015)

Jurisdiction	2002 – 2015 Change[1]		
	2002	2015	% Growth
Los Angeles County	3,862,958	4,443,133	15.0%
Los Angeles	1,469,633	1,751,988	19.2%
Vernon	47,647	40,670	-14.6%
Huntington Park	15,854	15,047	-5.1%
Bell	6,735	15,067	123.7%
Cudahy	2,436	3,200	31.4%
South Gate	17,605	21,694	23.2%
Downey	39,359	37,156	-5.6%
Paramount	17,607	19,206	9.1%
Bellflower	15,001	21,240	41.6%
Artesia	5,694	5,110	-10.3%
Cerritos	41,245	37,913	-8.1%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2019; TAHA, 2020
Note: [1] 2002 and 2015 employment data from US Census Bureau Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics "OnTheMap" is the most available data to characterize the historical employment growth.

4.1.3 Summary

Projects that are growth-inducing are typically located in more isolated or underdeveloped areas since these areas are more likely to require the additional infrastructure (e.g., housing, roads, utilities, schools) to support any growth that would accompany the project. Generally, these impacts are considered significant if a project would directly or indirectly lead to substantial population or employment growth in the project area that would exceed growth projections and planned capacities, or otherwise lead to a degradation of environmental quality such as increased noise or air quality.

Cities within the Affected Area are established communities that have generally experienced relative stability with population and housing growth and a mix of gains and losses in employment.

4.2 Forecasted Growth

Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 shows the average SCAG forecasted population, housing, and employment growth for the cities within the Affected Area from 2012 to 2040.

Table 4.5 summarizes the historical and SCAG forecasted population, housing, and employment growth. Based on the SCAG forecast data, population, housing, and job opportunities are expected to grow in the cities located in the Affected Area. Similar to the historical growth of the cities, the SCAG forecasted growth identifies correlated growth between population and housing in addition to employment growth within the region. Based on each city's built-out character, the cities are forecasted to have a steady growth, except the cities of Vernon and Cudahy. The City of Vernon would continue to be an exclusively industrial community with a few scattered commercial businesses and minimal residential uses. The high population and housing growth would be indicative of future growth in the small existing residential neighborhood. Forecasted population, housing, and employment growth would generally exceed the averaged historical growth, except the City of Cudahy. The City of Cudahy does not anticipate population, housing, or employment growth in the 2012 to 2040 forecasted growth compared to historical growth. The City of Bell expects reduced levels of employment growth. This may suggest little or no growth in the city for the forecasted growth.

Table 4.3. SCAG Forecasted Population and Housing Growth in the Cities within the Affected Area (2012-2040)

Jurisdiction	2012 – 2040 Average Growth					
	Population			Housing		
	2012	2040	% Growth	2012	2040	% Growth
Los Angeles County	9,922,600	11,514,800	16.0%	3,257,600	3,809,300	16.9%
Los Angeles City	3,845,500	4,609,400	19.9%	1,325,500	1,690,300	27.5%
Vernon	100	300	200.0%	0	100	100.0%
Huntington Park	58,500	67,400	15.2%	14,600	17,400	19.2%
Bell	35,700	36,900	3.4%	8,900	9,200	3.4%
Cudahy	23,800	23,800	0.0%	5,600	5,600	0.0%
South Gate	94,700	111,800	18.1%	23,200	28,300	22.0%
Downey	112,500	121,700	8.2%	33,900	37,300	10.0%
Paramount	54,500	58,000	6.4%	13,900	14,800	6.5%
Bellflower	77,100	79,600	3.2%	23,700	24,400	3.0%
Artesia	16,600	18,000	8.4%	4,500	5,000	11.1%
Cerritos	49,300	50,900	3.2%	15,500	16,000	3.2%

Source: US Department of Finance, 2010; US Department of Finance, 2017; US Census Bureau, 2019; SCAG, 2016; TAHA, 2020

Table 4.4. SCAG Forecasted Employment Growth in the Cities within the Affected Area (2012-2040)

Jurisdiction	2012 – 2040 Average Growth		
	2012	2040	% Growth
Los Angeles County	4,246,600	5,225,800	23.1%
Los Angeles	1,696,400	2,169,100	27.9%
Vernon	43,200	46,100	6.7%
Huntington Park	15,600	18,600	19.2%
Bell	12,400	13,700	10.5%
Cudahy	2,900	2,900	0.0%
South Gate	20,400	24,000	17.6%
Downey	37,300	51,900	39.1%
Paramount	19,600	22,300	13.8%
Bellflower	13,600	14,700	8.1%
Artesia	5,000	5,800	16.0%
Cerritos	30,400	33,700	10.9%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2019; TAHA, 2020
Note: [1] 2002 and 2015 employment data from US Census Bureau Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics "OnTheMap" is the most available data to characterize the historical employment growth.

Table 4.5. Historical Growth and SCAG Forecasted Growth (2012-2040) in the Cities within the Affected Area

Jurisdiction	2000 – 2017 Growth[1]			2012 – 2040 Average Growth		
	Population	Housing	Employment	Population	Housing	Employment
Los Angeles County	7.5%	7.6%	15.0%	16.0%	16.9%	23.1%
Los Angeles	8.8%	8.7%	19.2%	19.9%	27.5%	27.9%
Vernon	129.7%	129.7%	-14.6%	200.0%	100.0%	6.7%
Huntington Park	-3.1%	-3.3%	-5.1%	15.2%	19.2%	19.2%
Bell	-1.0%	-1.1%	123.7%	3.4%	3.4%	10.5%
Cudahy	0.5%	0.5%	31.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
South Gate	1.7%	1.8%	23.2%	18.1%	22.0%	17.6%
Downey	5.9%	7.0%	-5.6%	8.2%	10.0%	39.1%
Paramount	1.2%	1.2%	9.1%	6.4%	6.5%	13.8%
Bellflower	6.3%	6.2%	41.6%	3.2%	3.0%	8.1%
Artesia	2.4%	2.3%	-10.3%	8.4%	11.1%	16.0%
Cerritos	-2.8%	-2.9%	-8.1%	3.2%	3.2%	10.9%

Source: US Department of Finance, 2010; US Department of Finance, 2017; US Census Bureau, 2019; SCAG, 2016; TAHA, 2020
Note: [1] 2002 and 2015 employment data from US Census Bureau Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics "OnTheMap" is the most available data to characterize the historical employment growth.

5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

5.1 No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative includes regional projects identified in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, Metro's 2009 LRTP, and Measure M. These projects include the Metro East-West Line/Regional Connector/Eastside Phase 2, California High Speed Rail (CA HSR), Metro North-South Line/Regional Connector, I-710 South Corridor, I-105 Express Lane, I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" improvements projects, and improvements to the Metro bus system and local municipality bus system, listed in Table 2.1. Under the No Build Alternative, other projects identified in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, Metro's 2009 LRTP, and Measure M, as well as local projects, would continue to be built; however, the Project would not be developed.

Generally, infrastructure, transit and transportation projects would not directly foster growth within a region, but instead these project types are planned to accommodate forecasted growth in the local communities and in the greater region. These projects could also help redirect growth geographically throughout the SCAG region to areas more heavily served by transit. Metro's 2009 LRTP has determined that without additional capacity to the current transportation infrastructure system to serve forecasted growth, traffic would worsen throughout the region. The No Build Alterative would include infrastructure and transportation-related projects that would accommodate the existing and future transportation needs of the area. In addition, the infrastructure, transit-related, and transportation-related projects previously described would be located within a densely developed region and would not extend into previously undeveloped areas that could induce growth or remove a barrier for growth.

The No Build Alternative may not reach the full potential to accommodate forecasted population, housing, and employment growth along the Project alignment and in the communities that the Project would serve. The No Build Alternative could limit transit-related opportunities to intensify land uses at potential transit station areas and along the corridor; limit jurisdictions from developing compact communities around a public transit system; limit alternatives to automobile travel; and transit choices for residents, visitors, and employees (see *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Land Use Impact Analysis Report* [Metro 2021a]). However, the No Build Alternative would still implement the other identified transit and transportation improvements in the region to accommodate forecasted growth and development consistent with local plans on a project-specific basis and as forecasted in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS.

In summary, projects included in the No Build Alternative are identified and forecasted for in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, Metro's 2009 LRTP, and Measure M, and would provide infrastructure and transportation-related projects to accommodate and serve forecasted growth in the region and would not induce new growth. In addition, the No Build Alternative would not conflict with plans to accommodate population growth with future planning of TODs surrounding future proposed transit station areas as related to other transit projects. Economic growth would also be anticipated in the No Build Alternative through employment

opportunities and housing growth throughout the region. Thus, the No Build Alternative would not result in adverse growth-inducing effects.

5.2 Alternative 1: Los Angeles Union Station to Pioneer Station

Table 5.1 summarizes the SCAG-derived average forecasted population, housing, and employment growth for the Affected Area of the Build Alternatives from 2017 to build-out year 2042. The forecasted growth considers projects identified in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, Metro's 2009 LRTP, and Measure M, including this Project. Accordingly, population, housing, and employment growth is anticipated along the Build Alternatives alignment with population and housing growth being closely related. The Affected Area of Alternative 1 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 59.9 percent, 66.4 percent, and 32.4 percent, respectively.

Table 5.1. SCAG-Derived Forecasted Growth within the Affected Area of the Build Alternatives (2017-2042)

Build Alternative	2017 – 2042 Average Growth								
	Population			Housing			Employment		
	2017	2042	% Growth	2017	2042	% Growth	2017	2042	% Growth
Alternative 1	181,981	290,901	59.9%	49,830	82,933	66.4%	95,225	126,066	32.4%
Alternative 2	185,152	323,795	74.9%	59,399	109,578	84.5%	154,207	192,285	24.7%
Alternative 3	151,111	240,580	59.2%	39,338	63,711	62.0%	37,937	46,230	22.4%
Alternative 4	63,905	103,624	62.2%	18,084	30,006	65.9%	18,842	22,586	19.9%

Source: SCAG 2016a; U.S. Census Bureau 2016; TAHA, 2020.
Note: Affected Area = 0.25 miles on both sides of the alignment

Table 5.2 identifies the average SCAG-derived forecasted population, housing, and employment growth 0.5-mile around the proposed station areas from 2017 to build-out year 2042. Communities within the Affected Area vary in terms of population density; areas with a higher population density generally demonstrate a need for expanded transit service.

The highest population growth is projected in the Arts/Industrial District Station area (232.0 percent growth) and the lowest population growth is projected in the Pacific/Randolph Station area (19.1 percent). In correlation with the projected population growth, the Pioneer Station area is projected to have the highest housing growth (106.0 percent). The lowest household growth is projected in the Pacific/Randolph Station area (21.4 percent). Employment is projected to increase in the Affected Area for growth-inducing impacts consistent with the presence of industrial and commercial uses. Employment growth would increase the most in the Arts/Industrial District Station area (74.1 percent). The smallest increase in employment growth is projected in the LAUS Forecourt Station area (16.8 percent), which is indicative of the already job saturated area. (see *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Communities and Neighborhoods Impact Analysis Report* [Metro 2021b]).

Table 5.2. SCAG-Derived Forecasted Growth within 0.5-mile of the Station Areas (2017-2042)

Build Alternatives/Station Area	Population			Housing			Employment		
	2017	2042	% Growth	2017	2042	% Growth	2017	2042	% Growth
Alternative 1									
LAUS (Forecourt)	20,428	34,379	68.3%	6,329	9,690	53.1%	35,313	41,256	16.8%
Arts/Industrial District Station	2,898	9,622	232.0%	3,006	5,554	84.8%	17,966	31,287	74.1%
Alternative 2									
7th St/Metro Center Station	23,057	47,882	107.7%	14,738	28,169	91.1%	86,200	93,375	8.3%
South Park/Fashion District Station	23,303	53,280	128.6%	16,249	31,844	96.0%	56,642	71,979	27.1%
Arts/Industrial District Station	3,001	9,788	226.2%	3,057	5,623	83.9%	21,132	38,065	80.1%
Alternatives 1, 2, and 3									
Slauson/A Line Station	19,235	29,254	52.1%	4,184	6,555	56.7%	4,463	6,895	54.5%
Pacific/Randolph Station	22,839	27,199	19.1%	5,942	7,211	21.4%	6,883	8,038	16.8%
Florence/Salt Lake Station	20,636	24,745	19.9%	4,995	6,112	22.4%	1,380	1,689	22.4%
Firestone Station	14,224	24,498	72.2%	3,479	6,081	74.8%	4,041	4,473	10.7%
Gardendale Station	8,051	14,403	78.9%	2,040	3,944	93.3%	3,740	4,149	10.9%
Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4									
I-105/C Line Station	19,723	24,739	25.4%	4,679	6,414	37.1%	4,369	5,850	33.9%
Paramount/Rosecrans Station	16,135	19,614	21.6%	3,894	5,205	33.7%	3,045	4,295	41.1%
Bellflower Station	23,327	32,795	40.6%	7,356	10,199	38.6%	4,069	4,781	17.5%
Pioneer Station	10,203	21,345	109.2%	3,050	6,282	106.0%	5,923	7,232	22.1%
Design Options									
LAUS (MWD)	20,428	34,379	68.3%	6,329	9,690	53.1%	35,313	41,256	16.8%
Little Tokyo (Optional) Station	7,700	22,315	189.8%	5,402	11,596	114.7%	31,940	43,136	35.1%

Source: SCAG 2016a. U.S. Census Bureau 2016
Note: LAUS = Los Angeles Union Station; MWD = Metropolitan Water District

The Project is a transit infrastructure project proposed to serve forecasted population, housing, and employment growth within the Project corridor and SCAG region and accommodate the existing and future transportation needs of the area. Alternative 1 would not generate direct growth within the Project corridor and station areas, but instead would accommodate the redirected growth from throughout the SCAG region to the Project corridor and public transit options. The forecasted growth is identified in the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP and is not new unplanned growth. In addition, the Alternative 1 would be located within a densely developed region, both urban and suburban in character, and would not extend into previously undeveloped areas.

The SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 1 also indicates potential changes to the existing land uses surrounding the station areas as jurisdictions engage in future planning opportunities to intensify existing land uses. Potential indirect effects as a result of Alternative 1 would include the future planning and development of TODs surrounding the proposed station areas. Metro prepared the *West Santa Ana Branch Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan* (Metro 2019) to be used by local jurisdictions as a resource to develop new corridor-wide governance strategies and implement plans, policies, and economic development strategies to transform station areas into equitable, sustainable and safe areas for development in the Project corridor. As a toolkit for future planning, the plan does not contain specific plans for TOD development within the Project corridor. In addition, several jurisdictions in the corridor have completed or are in the process of developing their own individual station area plans. Regional and local policies encourage TOD planning and development including the intensification of land uses at potential station areas and along the corridor; development of compact communities around a public transit system; alternatives to automobile travel; and planning for residents, visitors, and employees within the vicinity of the areas (see *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Land Use Impact Analysis Report* [Metro, 2021a]). Such future planned densification of land uses is also incorporated into the forecasted SCAG growth data and is not considered unplanned growth. Implementation of Alternative 1 would be a catalyst to the TOD planning and development. Similarly, the TOD planning would not generate new unplanned growth, but instead would redistribute forecasted growth of a jurisdiction.

Alternative 1 would not result in growth inducing impacts or unplanned growth beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Rather, Alternative 1 would redirect planned growth to transit areas. Thus, Alternative 1 would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region and would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

5.3 Alternative 2: 7th Street/Metro Center to Pioneer Station

Direct and indirect growth inducing impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 2 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 74.9 percent, 84.5 percent, and 24.7 percent, respectively from 2017 to 2042 identified in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP.

As previously discussed in Section 5.2 and summarized in Table 5.2, the Arts/Industrial District Station area (226.2 percent growth) and Pacific/Randolph Station area (19.1 percent) are projected to have the highest and lowest population growth, respectively. The Pioneer Station

area (106.0 percent) and Pacific/Randolph Station area (21.4 percent) are projected to have the highest and lowest housing growth, respectively. The Arts/Industrial District Station area (80.1 percent) and 7th Street/Metro Center Station area (8.3 percent) would have the highest and lowest increase in employment growth, respectively. The low increase in employment growth is indicative of the already job-saturated downtown Los Angeles area.

Alternative 2 would not generate direct growth within the Project corridor and station areas, but instead would accommodate the redirected growth from throughout the SCAG region to the Project corridor and public transit options. Similarly, Alternative 2 would be a catalyst to TOD planning and development within the Project corridor, which would accommodate redistributed forecasted growth of a jurisdiction. Alternative 2 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 2 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Alternative 2 would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

5.4 Alternative 3: Slauson/A (Blue) Line to Pioneer Station

Direct and indirect growth inducing impacts for Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternatives 1 and 2. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 3 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 59.2 percent, 62.0 percent, and 22.4 percent, respectively from 2017 to 2042 identified in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP. Summarized in Table 5.2, the Pioneer Station area (109.2 percent growth) and Pacific/Randolph Station area (19.1 percent) are projected to have the highest and lowest population growth, respectively. The Pioneer Station area (106.0 percent) and Pacific/Randolph Station area (21.4 percent) are projected to have the highest and lowest housing growth, respectively. The Slauson/A Line Station area (54.5 percent) and Firestone Station area (8.3 percent) would have the highest and lowest increase in employment growth, respectively.

Alternative 3 would not generate direct growth within the Project corridor and station areas, but instead would accommodate the redirected growth from throughout the SCAG region to the Project corridor and public transit options. Similarly, Alternative 3 would be a catalyst to TOD planning and development within the Project corridor, which would accommodate redistributed forecasted growth of a jurisdiction. Alternative 3 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 3 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Alternative 3 would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

5.5 Alternative 4: I-105/C (Green) Line to Pioneer Station

Direct and indirect growth inducing impacts for Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 4 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 62.2 percent, 65.9 percent, and 19.9 percent, respectively from 2017 to 2042 identified in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP. Summarized in Table 5.2, the Pioneer Station area (109.2 percent) and Paramount/Rosecrans Station area (21.6 percent) are projected to have the highest and lowest population growth, respectively. The Pioneer Station

area (106.0 percent) and Paramount/Rosecrans Station area (33.7 percent) are projected to have the highest and lowest housing growth, respectively. The Paramount/Rosecrans area (41.4 percent) and Bellflower Station area (17.5 percent) would have the highest and lowest increase in employment growth, respectively.

Alternative 4 would not generate direct growth within the Project corridor and station areas, but instead would accommodate the redirected growth from throughout the SCAG region to the Project corridor and public transit options. Similarly, Alternative 4 would be a catalyst to TOD planning and development within the Project corridor, which would accommodate redistributed forecasted growth of a jurisdiction. Alternative 4 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 4 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Alternative 4 would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

5.6 Design Options

5.6.1 Design Option 1: LAUS at the Metropolitan Water District (MWD)

Design Option 1 would place the northern terminus underground east of LAUS and the MWD building and below the baggage area parking facility. Summarized in Table 5.2, Design Option 1 would not change the forecasted growth for population, housing, and employment (68.3 percent, 53.1 percent, and 16.8 percent, respectively) compared to the LAUS Forecourt. The change of location from the LAUS Forecourt to a location east of the LAUS and MWD building would serve and accommodate the forecasted growth for the Project corridor. In addition, Design Option 1 would not result in unplanned growth beyond what was identified and forecasted for in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP. Design Option 1 would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

5.6.2 Design Option 2: Add the Little Tokyo Station

Under Design Option 2, the Little Tokyo Station would be constructed. As shown in Table 5.2, the Little Tokyo Station has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 189.8 percent, 114.7 percent and 35.1 percent. Design Option 2 would serve and accommodate the forecasted growth for the Project corridor and in the Little Tokyo community and would not result in unplanned growth beyond what was identified and forecasted for in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP. Design Option 2 would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

5.7 Maintenance and Storage Facilities

Paramount MSF Site Option and Bellflower MSF Site Option. The Paramount MSF site option and Bellflower MSF site option would be an integral part of the Project's infrastructure and would support the maintenance, operations, and storage activities for the proposed LRT system. The MSF site options would improve the regional transportation system and support SCAG mobility goals by providing a reliable, alternative mode of transportation to the region. The MSF site options are not anticipated to generate population and housing growth and nominal employment growth could occur. However, employment opportunities would primarily consist of existing Metro employees that may be transferred from other existing MSFs and live within the region. Potential employment would not exceed forecasted projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. The MSF Options would not result in adverse effects related to unplanned growth.

6 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT DETERMINATION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e) requires that growth-inducing impacts be assessed. CEQA requires that the analysis identifies if the "proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment". CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e) also requires the analysis to identify if the project "would remove obstructions to population growth…[or] encourage and facilitate other activities that could scientifically affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively".

6.1 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Build Alternatives would not be constructed; no properties would be acquired for the Build Alternatives; no structures along the Project alignment would be demolished; and no new structures would be constructed. The No Project Alternative may not reach the full potential to accommodate forecasted population, housing, and employment growth along the Project alignment and in the communities that the Project would serve. The No Project Alternative would not induce new growth.

The No Project Alternative could limit transit-related opportunities to intensify land uses at potential transit station areas and along the corridor; limit jurisdictions from developing compact communities around a public transit system; and limit alternatives to automobile travel; and transit choices for residents, visitors, and employees (see *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Land Use Impact Analysis Report* [Metro 2021a]). The No Project Alternative would not anticipate indirect economic growth as the Build Alternatives would not be implemented. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.1.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures required.

6.1.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.2 Alternative 1: Los Angeles Union Station to Pioneer Station

The Project is a transit infrastructure project proposed to serve forecasted population, housing, and employment growth within the Project corridor and SCAG region and accommodate the existing and future transportation needs of the area. The forecasted growth is identified in the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP and is not new unplanned growth. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 1 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 59.9 percent, 66.4 percent, and 32.4 percent, respectively.

Alternative 1 would not generate direct growth within the Project corridor and station areas, but instead would accommodate the redirected growth from throughout the SCAG region to the Project corridor and public transit options. In addition, the Alternative 1 would be located within a densely developed region, both urban and suburban in character, and would not extend into previously undeveloped areas. Table 5.2 summarizes the projected population, housing, and employment growth within 0.5-mile around the proposed station areas. The low increase in employment growth is indicative of the already job-saturated downtown Los Angeles area.

Potential indirect effects related to Alternative 1 would include the future planning and development of TODs surrounding the proposed station areas. Metro prepared the *West Santa Ana Branch Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan* (Metro 2019) to be used by local jurisdictions as a resource to develop new corridor-wide governance strategies and implement plans, policies, and economic development strategies to transform station areas into equitable, sustainable and safe areas for development in the Project corridor. As a toolkit for future planning, the plan does not contain specific plans for TOD development within the Project corridor. In addition, several jurisdictions in the corridor have completed or are in the process of developing their own individual station area plans. Such future planned densification of land uses is also incorporated into the forecasted SCAG growth data and is not considered unplanned growth. TOD planning would not generate new unplanned growth, but instead would redistribute forecasted growth of a jurisdiction.

As such, Alternative 1 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 1 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.2.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures.

6.2.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.3 Alternative 2: 7th Street/Metro Center to Pioneer Station

Direct and indirect growth inducing impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 2 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 74.9 percent, 84.5 percent, and 24.7 percent, respectively. Table 5.2 summarizes the projected population, housing, and employment growth within 0.5-mile around the proposed station areas. The low increase in employment growth is indicative of the already job-saturated downtown Los Angeles area. Alternative 2 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 2 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.3.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures.

6.3.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.4 Alternative 3: Slauson/A (Blue) Line to Pioneer Station

Direct and indirect growth inducing impacts for Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternatives 1 and 2. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 3 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 59.2 percent, 62.0 percent, and 22.4 percent, respectively. Table 5.2 summarizes the projected population, housing, and employment growth within 0.5-mile around the proposed station areas. Alternative 3 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 3 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.4.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures.

6.4.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.5 Alternative 4: I-105/C (Green) Line to Pioneer Station

Direct and indirect growth inducing impacts for Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. As shown in Table 5.1, the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area of Alternative 4 has a forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 62.2 percent, 65.9 percent, and 19.9 percent, respectively. Table 5.2 summarizes the projected population, housing, and employment growth within 0.5-mile around the proposed station areas. Alternative 4 would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, beyond growth already anticipated in the regional plans and projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. Alternative 4 would redirect planned growth to transit areas and would provide benefits to jurisdictions in the Project corridor and in the SCAG region. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.5.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures.

6.5.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.6 Design Options

6.6.1 Design Option 1: LAUS at the Metropolitan Water District (MWD)

Summarized in Table 5.2, Design Option 1 would place the northern terminus underground east of LAUS and the MWD building, below the baggage area parking facility. Design Option

1 would not change the SCAG-derived forecasted growth for the Affected Area for population, housing, and employment (68.3 percent, 53.1 percent, and 16.8 percent, respectively) compared to the LAUS Forecourt. The change of location from the LAUS Forecourt to a location east of the LAUS and MWD building would serve and accommodate forecasted growth for the Project corridor and would not result in unplanned growth beyond what was identified and forecasted for in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP. Design Option 1 would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.6.1.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures required.

6.6.1.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.6.2 Design Option 2: Add the Little Tokyo Station

Summarized in Table 5.2, Design Option 2 has a SCAG-derived forecasted population, housing, and employment growth of 189.8 percent, 114.7 percent and 35.1 percent, respectively. Design Option 2 would serve and accommodate the forecasted growth for the Project corridor and in the Little Tokyo community and would not result in unplanned growth beyond what was identified and forecasted for in the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and Metro's 2009 LRTP. Design Option 2 would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.6.2.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures required.

6.6.2.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

6.7 Maintenance and Storage Facilities

Paramount MSF Site Option and Bellflower MSF Site Option. The Paramount MSF site option and Bellflower MSF site option would be an integral part of the Project's infrastructure and would support the maintenance, operations, and storage activities for the proposed LRT system. The MSF site options would improve the regional transportation system and support SCAG mobility goals by providing a reliable, alternative mode of transportation to the region. The MSF site options are not anticipated to generate population and housing growth and nominal employment growth could occur. However, employment opportunities would primarily consist of existing Metro employees that may be transferred from other existing MSFs and live within the region. Potential employment would not exceed forecasted projections for the SCAG region, or in local land use and community plans. The MSF site options would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

6.7.1 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures.

6.7.2 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

No impact.

7 PROJECT MEASURES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

7.1 Project Measures

No project measures are required.

7.2 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

8 REFERENCES

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2019. *West Santa Ana Branch Transit-Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan*.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2021a. *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Land Use Impact Analysis Report*.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2021b. *West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor Project Final Communities and Neighborhoods Impact Analysis Report*.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016. *2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy,* adopted April 2016.

US Census Bureau. 2019. Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD), https://lehd.ces.census.gov/, accessed January 7, 2019.

US Department of Finance. 2010. *Table E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates,* April 2010.

US Department of Finance. 2017. *Table E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates,* January 2017.