

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or to the location of the project that could feasibly avoid or lessen significant environmental impacts while substantially attaining the basic objectives of the project.<sup>1</sup> An EIR should also evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This chapter sets forth potential alternatives to the proposed project and provides a qualitative analysis of each alternative and a comparison of each alternative to the proposed project. Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines pertaining to the alternatives analysis are summarized below.<sup>2</sup>

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project including alternative locations that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- The No Project Alternative shall be evaluated along with its potential impacts. The No Project Alternative analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason." Therefore, the EIR must evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project.
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The range of feasible alternatives is selected and discussed in a manner intended to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives (as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f][1]) are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are feasible, and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration.<sup>3</sup> Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects.<sup>4</sup>

### 5.1 PROJECT-LEVEL IMPACTS

As addressed in this EIR, the proposed projects would create significant and unavoidable impacts associated with:

- **Transportation and Traffic (Intersections).** Implementation of Mitigation Measures T1 through T4 would potentially reduce congestion on impacted intersections; however, the degree to which signal

<sup>1</sup>CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, § 15126.6, 2005.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>CEQA Guidelines, CCR, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §15126.6(f)(3), 2005.

<sup>4</sup>CEQA Guidelines, CCR, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §15126.6(c), 2005.

optimization and transportation demand management (TDM) would mitigate intersection congestion is uncertain at this time. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts to traffic circulation would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

As called for by the CEQA Guidelines, the achievement of project objectives must be balanced by the ability of an alternative to reduce the significant impacts of the project. The proposed projects' objectives include:

### **Proposed Projects' Objectives**

The primary objectives of the proposed projects are as follows:

- Continue to implement the goals of the City of Los Angeles Transportation Plan and the 2010 Bicycle Plan by designing and installing bicycle lanes throughout the City on the schedule identified in the 2010 Bicycle Plan.
- Improve connectivity of bicycle lanes to provide increasing cross-town (north south and east west) bicycle access.
- Provide for bicycle access to regional transit stops.
- Improve bicycle safety in the City of Los Angeles and therefore encourage bicycle use for all trip types.
- Increase bicycle and pedestrian trips as a percentage of total trips and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Encourage multi-modal travel by creating a better environment for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users while accommodating vehicles.
- Increase mobility through:
  - Developing transportation alternatives;
  - Making streets more accessible to bicycles and pedestrians.
- Facilitate pedestrian activity by making existing streets more pedestrian-friendly.
- Provide opportunities to increase public health by providing bicycling facilities and pedestrian-friendly environments.
- Link South Los Angeles to Downtown Los Angeles with enhanced design and pedestrian elements.

Any evaluated alternative should meet as many of these project objectives as possible. In addition, while not specifically required under CEQA, other parameters may be used to further establish criteria for selecting alternatives such as adjustments to project phasing, conformance to all existing zoning requirements, and other "fine-tuning" that could shape feasible alternatives in a manner that may result in reducing identified environmental impacts. In some instances, when the project results in environmental impacts that are reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation, an alternative may reduce these less-than-significant impacts even further.

## **5.2 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECTS**

---

The CEQA statute, the CEQA Guidelines, and related recent court cases do not specify a precise number of alternatives to be evaluated in an EIR. Rather, "the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the rule of reason that sets forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice."<sup>5</sup> At the same time, Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that "...the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project" and Section 15126.6(f) requires, "The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." Accordingly, alternatives that would not address potentially significant effects are not considered herein. However, the CEQA Guidelines require that a "No Project" alternative must be included and, if appropriate, an alternative

---

<sup>5</sup>Section 15126.6(f).

site location should be analyzed.<sup>6</sup> Other project alternatives may involve a modification of the proposed land uses, density, or other project elements at the same project location.

Alternatives should be selected on the basis of their ability to attain all or most of the basic objectives of the project while reducing the project's significant environmental effects. The CEQA Guidelines state that "...[t]he EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting alternatives to be discussed [and]...shall include sufficient information to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis and comparison with the proposed project."<sup>7</sup> The feasibility of the alternatives is another consideration in the selection of alternatives. The CEQA Guidelines state that "[a]mong the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations [and] jurisdictional boundaries..."<sup>8</sup> "The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making."<sup>9</sup> Alternatives that are considered remote or speculative, or whose effects cannot be reasonably predicted do not require consideration. Therefore, feasibility, the potential to mitigate significant project-related impacts, and reasonably informing the decision-maker are the primary considerations in the selection and evaluation of alternatives.

With respect to bicycle lanes, some lanes included as part of the Proposed Project are reinforced by other lanes by expanding the bicycle network in a given area and connecting bicycle riders to their destination, while some lanes may be approved or rejected without having a substantial impact on how the other lanes function. Also, to the extent that parallel lane options exist in close proximity to these lane options (as identified in the 2010 Bicycle Plan), some of these potential lane options are other projects that are planned for implementation later in the 2010 Bicycle Plan implementation timeline. As bicycle lanes increase and provide connectivity throughout the region, bicycle as a viable mode of travel is anticipated to increase substantially as these facilities are safer, more attractive and therefore more appealing to previously reluctant riders.

### **Alternative 1 - No Build Alternative**

The No Build Alternative is required by Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines and assumes that the proposed projects would not be implemented. The No Build Alternative allows decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The No Build Alternative includes "what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services" (CEQA Section 15126.6 [e][2]).

Alternative 1 assumes that bike lanes would not be built or interconnected beyond current levels, and other programmatic changes proposed in the Bicycle Plan, such as education, enforcement, encouragement and evaluation programs, would not be approved or implemented without further actions by the City. Additionally, streetscape improvements proposed under the My Figueroa Streetscape Project would not occur under this alternative.

### **Alternative 2A - Increased Parking Removal/Alternate Travel Lane Impacts**

Alternative 2A includes the removal of a parking or a different travel lane along 15 streets (the removal of an alternate travel lane to that proposed under the project condition). The affected study streets are Lankershim Boulevard, Cahuenga Boulevard West, Cesar E. Chavez Boulevard, 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Vermont Avenue, N. Figueroa Street, S. Figueroa Street, Westwood Boulevard, Bundy Drive, Centinela Avenue, Sepulveda Boulevard, Avenue or the Stars, Colorado Boulevard, 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and Grand Avenue. Alternative 2A would potentially

---

<sup>6</sup>Section 15126.6(e) and Section 15126(f)(2).

<sup>7</sup>Section 15126.6(e) and Section 15126(f).

<sup>8</sup>Section 15126.6(f)(1).

<sup>9</sup>Section 15126.6(f).

cause changes in traffic circulation, parking, and transit operation along these affected streets. Alternative 2A is described below.

*Venice Boulevard.* No change is proposed under this alternative.

*Lankershim Boulevard.* This alternative would retain the existing lane configuration and eliminate parking on one side of the street from the Los Angeles River to Chandler Boulevard.

*Cahuenga Boulevard West.* This alternative would retain parking at the locations with double left turn pockets but would reduce the double left turn pockets to single left turn pockets.

*Cahuenga Boulevard East.* No change is proposed under this alternative.

*Cesar E. Chavez Avenue.* This alternative would involve removing parking on both sides of the street in order to retain three fulltime eastbound lanes. Due to the loss of parking lanes, a bicycle-transit-only lane would not be feasible in lieu of a standard bike lane in the westbound direction.

*7<sup>th</sup> Street.* This alternative would retain the existing lane configuration but would eliminate parking on both sides of the street.

*Vermont Avenue.* This alternative would generally retain the existing lane configuration, except for the loss of the short northbound third travel lane at Wilshire Boulevard, and would eliminate parking on both sides of the street.

*Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.* No change is proposed under this alternative.

*North Figueroa Street.* This alternative would be similar to the proposed projects, except the section between Avenue 26 and Pasadena Avenue, would have no lanes removed. Between York Boulevard and Colorado Boulevard, parking would be kept as-is and southbound lanes would be reduced from two to one.

*South Figueroa Street (Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to 7<sup>th</sup> Street - My Figueroa Streetscape Project).* This alternative would include installation of standard bike lanes for the entire study area as opposed to buffered bike lanes under the proposed projects.

*Westwood Boulevard.* This alternative would convert the northbound peak-period lane north of Pico Boulevard to a full-time lane, but would eliminate one full-time southbound lane.

*Bundy Drive.* This alternative would involve the same conditions as the proposed projects, with the exception that between Wilshire Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard, only a southbound lane would be eliminated. Parking would be eliminated on both sides of the street where present within this same section.

*Centinela Avenue.* This alternative would eliminate a southbound lane.

*Sepulveda Boulevard.* This alternative would eliminate one northbound lane from Ohio to Olympic, and one lane in each direction south of Olympic, and the introduction of a center left turn lane in most areas.

*Avenue of the Stars.* This alternative would remove one lane in each direction for the full length of the road segment, resulting in the reduction of the triple left turn pocket on Pico Boulevard to two left turn pockets.

*Colorado Boulevard.* Option 1 would eliminate one lane in each direction from Eagle Rock Boulevard to Avenue 64. Option 2 would eliminate parking on both sides of the street from Eagle Rock Boulevard to the SR-134 Freeway Ramps and allow for the retention of the existing lane configuration within this segment.

*Devonshire Street (Haskell Avenue to Sepulveda Boulevard).* No change is proposed.

*2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Beverly Boulevard/Glendale Boulevard to Broadway).* This alternative would maintain the existing lane configuration from Beverly Boulevard/Glendale Boulevard to Figueroa Street, and would instead eliminate parking on one side of the street.

*Grand Avenue (Washington Boulevard to 30<sup>th</sup> Street).* This alternative would result in the elimination of parking on both sides of the street throughout the corridor while the existing lane configuration would be retained.

*Virgil Avenue (Melrose Avenue to Santa Monica Boulevard).* No change is proposed.

Alternative 2A would cause a net decrease in parking spaces on ten streets for a total loss of 1,383 parking spaces (as compared to 529 parking spaces under the proposed projects). As shown in Table 4.3-3, adjacent land uses consists mostly of commercial uses with a few industrial and residential uses as well.

### **Alternative 2B - Increased Parking Removal/Alternate Travel Lane Impacts Variant**

This alternative would be similar to Alternative 2A, except for five streets: N. Figueroa Street, Westwood Boulevard, Bundy Drive, Centinela Avenue, and Colorado Boulevard. Instead of removing a travel lane under Alternative 2A, Alternative 2B proposes the removal of parking along these streets in the study areas.

*Westwood Boulevard.* Alternative 2B scenario would eliminate parking on both sides of the street.

*Bundy Drive.* Alternative 2B would have the same roadway land configuration as the proposed projects, except that a southbound lane between Wilshire Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard and parking on both sides of the street south of Olympic Boulevard would be eliminated.

*Centinela Avenue.* Alternative 2B would retain the existing lane configuration, but would eliminate parking on both sides of the street. Therefore, there would be no additional delays from the existing condition.

*Colorado Boulevard.* Alternative 2B would retain the existing lane configuration, but eliminate parking on both sides from Eagle Rock Boulevard to SR-134 ramps.

The summary comparison of impacts of the project alternatives and the proposed projects is included in **Table 5-1**.

### **Alternative 3 - Alternate Bikeway Options**

Alternative 3 would implement bikeways along Century Park East instead of Avenue of the Stars and along Overland Avenue instead of Westwood Boulevard as follows:

- Century Park East could potentially serve as a potential alternate route to Avenue of the Stars, as it provides a similar connection from Pico Boulevard to Santa Monica Boulevard. However, such a connection would be further east from the existing bike lanes on Motor Avenue at the south end, and Santa Monica Boulevard at the north end, requiring persons to navigate on each of these roadways without the presence of bike facilities.
- Overland Avenue has been suggested as a potential alternate route to Westwood Boulevard. This route has limitations, as it is too narrow in places and doesn't connect to the University of California at Los Angeles or the future light rail station at the intersection of Westwood Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard and therefore does not meet basic project objectives of connectivity.

No alternate routes (that are not already identified as bicycle routes in the 2010 Bicycle Plan) have been identified for other study areas that would provide similar connections to the existing bicycle network or between major attractions.

<b>TABLE 5-1: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECTS</b>					
<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Projects' Impact</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Build Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2A Increased Parking Removal Alternate Travel Lane Impacts</b>	<b>Alternative 2B Increased Parking Removal/Alternate Travel Lane Impacts Variant</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Alternate Bikeway Options</b>
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>					
Regional	Less than Significant	(More)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Localized	Less than Significant	(More)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Toxic Air Contaminants	Less than Significant	No Impact	(Similar)/Less than Significant	(Similar)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Odors	Less than Significant	No Impact	(Similar)/Less than Significant	(Similar)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>					
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less than Significant	(More)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations	Less than Significant	(More)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
<b>LAND USE &amp; PLANNING</b>					
Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies	Less than Significant	No Impact	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	(Potentially greater) / Less than Significant
Land Use Compatibility	Less than Significant	No Impact	(Potentially greater)/Less than Significant	(Potentially greater)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
<b>NOISE &amp; VIBRATION</b>					
Noise	Less than Significant	(More)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Groundborne Vibration	Less than Significant	(More)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	(Less)/Less than Significant	Less than Significant
<b>TRANSPORTATION &amp; TRAFFIC</b>					
Circulation System (Intersections)	Significant and Unavoidable	No Impact	Significant (Less number of intersections impacted than the proposed projects)	Significant (Less number of intersections impacted than the proposed projects)	Significant
Congestion Management Program	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Emergency Access	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No impact	No Impact
Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities	Potentially Significant Impact to Transit operations along routes without a bus lane	No Impact	Potentially Significant Impact related to transit (one more intersection impacted than under the proposed project).	Potentially Significant Impact related to transit (one less intersection impacted than under the proposed projects).	Potentially Significant Impact related to transit similar to the project.
<b>SOURCE:</b> TAHA, 2012					

## **ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE**

### **Air Quality**

Under Alternative 1, there would be no construction activities that would generate construction-related emissions at the project area. Alternative 1 would not reduce the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) that would occur with the proposed projects, which would result in beneficial air quality effects. Mobile and stationary source emissions would remain as they currently are and would not exceed SCAQMD regional or localized thresholds. While Alternative 1 would not result in beneficial effects to air quality compared to the proposed projects, Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impacts related to air quality.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Under Alternative 1, there would be no construction activities that would generate construction-related emissions in the project area. The existing uses within the project area would remain unchanged and impacts associated with operational emissions would remain the same. Trips generated from the project area would remain the same, resulting in similar GHG emissions to existing conditions. Without implementation of the bicycle lanes, GHG emissions would not be reduced. While Alternative 1 would not result in beneficial effects to GHG compared to the proposed projects, Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Under Alternative 1, existing conditions of the project area would not change. Specifically, land uses along the segments and in the surrounding area would not change. No impacts to land uses would occur under this alternative.

### **Noise and Vibration**

Under Alternative 1, there would be no construction activities that would generate construction-related noise or vibration in the project area. There would be no anticipated incremental increase in operation noise or vibration levels. Alternative 1 would not convert private automobile travelers to bicycle uses and no automobile volume reduction is expected to occur. Hence, Alternative 1 would not experience a noise or vibration levels reduction at adjacent land uses. While Alternative 1 would not result in beneficiary effects to noise and vibration levels compared to the proposed projects, Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impacts related to noise and vibration levels.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

If the project improvements were not implemented, transportation network conditions would remain in their current condition for a time but would deteriorate as cumulative development increases. Without bicycle lanes and improved street conditions, mode shifts to bicycle would not occur as rapidly, and streets could become increasingly congested – possibly more in the long term than would occur with implementation of the projects.

In the short-term intersection delays and LOS would remain the same as the existing condition in the study areas. Transit service under Alternative 1 would be largely the same as it is now, unless changes are proposed as part of a separate project. Lane striping and parking would remain as is. Alternative 1 would not have impacts on bicycle or pedestrian facilities. However, lack of safe bicycle facilities with increasing number of vehicular traffic on the roadways would lead to deteriorating quality of bicycle travel in the City.

The City would not benefit from any potential reduction in vehicle trips that could result by implementing the proposed projects, and would not realize the 2010 Bicycle Plan's overall goal of making bicycling safer and an integral part of daily life by enabling residents to make trips on bicycle rather than by personal vehicle.

However, since the reduction of motor vehicle travel lanes would not occur under Alternative 1, no significant impacts to transportation and traffic would result over the near term.

**ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE 2A – INCREASED PARKING REMOVAL/ALTERNATE TRAVEL LANE IMPACTS**

Alternative 2A would have the same or reduced impacts as the proposed projects for the topics shown in Table 5-2.

<b>TABLE 5-2: SUMMARY OF SIMILAR IMPACTS BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE 2A AND THE PROPOSED PROJECTS</b>		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Impact Conclusion</b>
Air Quality	4.1	<i>Construction</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Operational</i> : Less than Significant
		Toxic Air Contaminants and Odors: Less than Significant
		<i>Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies</i> : Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	4.2	<i>Construction and Operation and Plans and Policies</i> : Less than Significant
Land Use	4.3	<i>Land Use Compatibility</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies</i> : Potentially greater than the project/Less than Significant
Noise and Vibration	4.4	<i>Construction Noise</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Construction Vibration</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Operational Noise</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Operational Vibration</i> : Less than Significant
Traffic and Transportation	4.5	<i>Intersections</i> : Significant and Unavoidable Impacts
		<i>CMP</i> : No Impacts
		<i>Emergency Access</i> : No Impacts
		<i>Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i> : Potentially Significant Impact related to transit (One more intersection impacted than under the proposed projects)

SOURCE: TAHA, 2012

Alternative 2A would have the following impacts:

**Air Quality**

Under Alternative 2A, the type of daily construction activity, which emissions were based on, would not change from the proposed projects. Alternative 2A would result in the loss of fewer vehicular travel lanes. Consequently, this alternative would result in fewer locations where traffic delay would occur and in those locations idling emissions would not occur under Alternative 2A as compared to the proposed projects. While both Alternative 2A and the proposed projects could result in beneficial air quality effects (as a result of increased bicycle share), Alternative 2A could result in decreased impacts as compared to the proposed project since idling emissions would be less in some locations.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Annual GHG emissions could be reduced more than under the proposed projects. With the removal of fewer travel lanes, traffic flow would be similar to existing traffic conditions in locations where travel lanes are not removed. The removal of parking does not result in traffic delay and idling emissions but could result in additional VMT if people drive further to find parking or seek an alternate destination with more convenient parking. GHG emissions would be less than the established significance threshold. Both Alternative 2A and the proposed projects could result in beneficial impacts to GHG emissions as a result of increased bicycle mode share.

## Land Use

Alternative 2A would include the removal of a parking or a different travel lane along 15 streets (the removal of an alternate travel lane to that proposed under the project condition). The affected study streets are Lankershim Boulevard, Cahuenga Boulevard West, Cesar E. Chavez Boulevard, 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Vermont Avenue, N. Figueroa Street, S. Figueroa Street, Westwood Boulevard, Bundy Drive, Centinela Avenue, Sepulveda Boulevard, Avenue of the Stars, Colorado Boulevard, 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and Grand Avenue. Specifically, parking would be eliminated or limited along the following segments:

- Lankershim Boulevard
- Cesar E. Chavez Avenue
- 7<sup>th</sup> Street
- Vermont Avenue
- Bundy Drive
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Beverly Boulevard/Glendale Boulevard to Broadway)
- Grand Avenue (Washington Boulevard to 30<sup>th</sup> Street)

Alternative 2A would potentially cause changes in parking for the surrounding land uses, which include residential and/or commercial uses. Similar to the proposed projects, this proposed loss or limitation of parking could result in an indirect impact to land uses by impacting use of businesses or residences by making parking more difficult for these uses. For some uses on-site parking or other nearby parking options may be available. In some areas where older buildings lack on-site parking and adjacent residential streets include parking restrictions, parking may be substantially more difficult. In general, while lack of parking would result in an adverse impact to some uses, it is not anticipated that the change in parking availability would be sufficient to result in a significant change to the land use. Thus, loss of parking would be considered adverse, but a less than significant impact

Impacts related to land use plans and policies would be similar to those anticipated to occur under the proposed projects. This alternative would be consistent with community plan objectives related to the promotion of pedestrian and bicycle use but partially inconsistent with policies related to facilitating traffic volumes and provision of parking due to the loss of travel and parking lanes that would occur under this alternative. This would be considered a less than significant impact.

## Noise and Vibration

Under Alternative 2A, the predicted noise and vibration levels at adjacent sensitive land uses could be slightly higher than the proposed projects where travel lanes are not removed and speeds would be increased compared to the projects (increased speeds leads to more noise, but not greater than under existing conditions). Without the removal of some travel lanes, Alternative 2A would have more lanes available to traffic. As with the projects, Alternative 2A would not generate new vehicle trips. Similar to the proposed projects, Alternative 2A would result in a less than significant impacts related to noise and vibration.

## Traffic and Transportation

Alternative 2A would cause significant impacts at 61 intersections during the AM peak hour and 70 intersections during the PM peak hour. Compared to the proposed projects, the number of intersections with significant impacts would decrease from 63 to 61 intersections in the AM peak hour and from 71 to 70 intersections in the PM peak hour. Of the 63 intersections that would be changed (as compared to the project) under the Alternative 2A scenario, a total of 37 intersections would have significant impacts in the AM peak hour and 30 intersections would have significant impacts in the PM peak hour. While impacts would be less than the proposed projects, the Alternative 2A scenario would still result in a significant impact related to the circulation system. Alternative 2A would cause a net decrease in parking spaces on ten streets for a total loss of 1,162 parking spaces (as compared to 815 parking spaces under the proposed projects). Loss of parking may increase VMT as drivers look for more parking and/or drive to alternate

destinations with convenient parking. However, this increased VMT would typically be off-set by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area and thus impacts would be considered less than significant.

Transit impacts under Alternative 2A would be similar to the proposed projects except for Cesar E. Chavez Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard. As a result, Alternative 2A would result in a significant impact related to transit operation. Compared to the proposed projects, the number of study streets with significant transit impacts would increase from four to six.

**ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE 2B – INCREASED PARKING REMOVAL/ALTERNATE TRAVEL LANE IMPACTS VARIANT**

Alternative 2B would have the same or reduced impacts as the proposed projects for the topics shown in **Table 5-3**.

<b>TABLE 5-3: SUMMARY OF SIMILAR IMPACTS BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE 2B AND THE PROPOSED PROJECTS</b>		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Impact Conclusion</b>
Air Quality	4.1	<i>Construction</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Operational</i> : Less than Significant
		Toxic Air Contaminants and Odors: Less than Significant
		<i>Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies</i> : Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	4.2	<i>Construction and Operation, Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies</i> : Less than Significant
Land Use	4.3	<i>Land Use Compatibility</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies</i> : Potentially greater than the project/Less than Significant
Noise and Vibration	4.4	<i>Construction Noise</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Construction Vibration</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Operational Noise</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Operational Vibration</i> : Less than Significant
		<i>Construction Noise</i> : Less than Significant
Traffic and Transportation	4.5	<i>Intersections</i> : Significant and Unavoidable Impacts
		<i>CMP</i> : No Impacts
		<i>Emergency Access</i> : No Impacts
		<i>Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i> : Potentially Significant Impact related to transit (One less intersection impacted than under the proposed projects)

SOURCE: TAHA, 2012

Alternative 2B would have the following impacts:

**Air Quality**

Under Alternative 2B, impacts would be similar to the analysis previously discussed under Alternative 2A. While both Alternative 2B and the proposed projects would result in beneficial air quality effects, Alternative 2B would result in decreased impacts as compared to the proposed projects since there would be fewer idling emissions related to parking removal as compared to removal of travel lanes.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Under Alternative 2B, annual GHG emissions impacts would be similar to the analysis previously discussed under Alternative 2A. While both Alternative 2B and the proposed projects would result in beneficial

reduction to GHG emissions, Alternative 2B would result in fewer impacts as compared to the proposed projects since there would be fewer idling emissions related to parking removal, as compared to lane removal. Although VMT may increase slightly as people drive further to find parking and/or drive to alternate destinations with more convenient parking. However, this increased VMT would typically be off-set by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area and its impacts would be considered less than significant.

### **Land Use**

Under Alternative 2B, parking would be lost along an increased number of the bicycle lane segments (Alternative 2B would be similar to Alternative 2A, except for five streets: N. Figueroa Street, Westwood Boulevard, Bundy Drive, Centinela Avenue, and Colorado Boulevard -- instead of removing a travel lane under Alternative 2A, Alternative 2B proposes the removal of parking along these streets in the study areas). This would cause changes in parking supply for the surrounding land uses, which include residential and/or commercial uses. Similar to the proposed projects, this proposed loss or limitation of parking could result in an indirect impact to land uses by impacting use of businesses or residences by making parking more difficult for these uses. For some uses on-site parking or other nearby parking options may be available. In some areas where older buildings lack on-site parking and adjacent residential streets include parking restrictions, parking may be substantially more difficult. In general, while parking could be more difficult for some uses, and the impact would be considered adverse, it is not anticipated that the change in parking availability would be sufficient to result in a significant change to the land use. Therefore, this impact is considered adverse but less than significant.

Impacts related to land use plans and policies would be similar to those anticipated to occur under the proposed projects. This alternative would be consistent with community plan objectives related to the promotion of pedestrian and bicycle use but partially inconsistent with policies related to facilitating traffic volumes and provision of parking due to the loss of travel and parking lanes that would occur under this alternative. This would be considered a less than significant impact.

### **Noise and Vibration**

Under Alternative 2B, impacts would be similar to the analysis previously discussed under Alternative 2A. Similar to the proposed projects, Alternative 2B would result in a less than significant impacts related to noise and vibration.

### **Traffic and Transportation**

Alternative 2B would cause significant impacts at 59 intersections during the AM peak hour and 67 intersections during the PM peak hour. Compared to the proposed projects, the number of intersections with significant impacts would decrease from 63 to 59 intersections in the AM peak hour and from 71 to 67 intersections in the PM peak hour. Of the 18 intersections that would be changed (as compared to the project) under Alternative 2B scenario, three intersections would have significant impacts in the AM and PM peak hours. While impacts would be less than the proposed projects, the Alternative 2B scenario would still result in a significant impact related to the circulation system.

Alternative 2B would cause a net decrease in parking spaces on ten study areas for a total loss of 2,177 parking spaces (as compared to 815 parking spaces under the projects). This alternative would cause increased traffic delays along N. Figueroa Street, Bundy Drive and Colorado Boulevard, and this would cause increased transit delays. As a result, Alternative 2B would result in a potentially significant impact related to transit operation. In comparison, Alternative 2B would have transit impacts on one less study street (among the ones that would change under Alternative 2B) than the proposed projects condition. Loss of parking adjacent to neighborhood retail may increase VMT as drivers look for more parking and/or drive to alternate destinations with convenient parking. However, this increased VMT would typically be off-set by a

reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area and thus this impact would be considered less than significant.

**ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE 3 – ALTERNATE BIKEWAY OPTIONS**

Alternative 3 would have the same or reduced impacts as the proposed projects for the topics shown in **Table 5-4**.

<b>TABLE 5-4: SUMMARY OF SIMILAR IMPACTS BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE 3 AND THE PROPOSED PROJECTS</b>		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Impact Conclusion</b>
Air Quality	4.1	Construction: Less than Significant
		Operational: Less than Significant
		Toxic Air Contaminants and Odors: Less than Significant
		<i>Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies:</i> Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	4.2	<i>Operation and Construction, Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies:</i> Less than Significant
Land Use	4.3	<i>Land Use Compatibility:</i> Less than Significant
		<i>Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies:</i> Less than Significant
Noise and Vibration	4.4	<i>Construction Noise:</i> Less than Significant
		<i>Construction Vibration:</i> Less than Significant
		<i>Operational Noise:</i> Less than Significant
		<i>Operational Vibration:</i> Less than Significant
		<i>Construction Noise:</i> Less than Significant
Traffic and Transportation	4.5	<i>Intersections:</i> Significant and Unavoidable Impacts
		<i>CMP:</i> No Impacts
		<i>Emergency Access:</i> No Impacts
		<i>Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities:</i> Potentially Significant Impact related to transit

**SOURCE:** TAHA, 2012

Alternative 3 would have the following impacts:

**Air Quality**

Under Alternative 3, all components of this alternative would be similar to those included under the proposed projects except for minor bicycle route changes from Avenue of the Stars to Century Park East and along Overland Avenue instead of Westwood Boulevard. Similar to the proposed projects, Alternative 3 would result in a less than significant impact related to air quality.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Under Alternative 3, GHG emissions related to automobile volume reduction would be similar to that predicted under the proposed projects. Alternative 3 would be consistent with applicable plans and policies. Similar to the proposed projects, Alternative 3 would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions.

**Land Use**

Alternative 3 would include implementing bikeways along Century Park East instead of Avenue of the Stars and along Overland Avenue instead of Westwood Boulevard. Alternative 3 is less consistent than the proposed projects with the Bicycle Plan, as neither Overland Avenue nor Century Park East are called out to as Bicycle Lane designation, or show up on the either of the Neighborhood or Backbone Networks. All other components of this alternative would be similar to those included under the proposed projects. Impacts to land use compatibility and consistency with plans and policies would be similar (although less consistent

with policy) to those anticipated to occur under the proposed projects. The lack of connectivity provided by the Overland Avenue alternate route would not address project objectives making it less consistent with City Policy.

### **Noise and Vibration**

Under Alternative 3, no significant impacts are anticipated since construction activities would be similar to the proposed projects. No additional construction-related noise or vibration levels would occur from what was described for the proposed projects. Similar to the proposed projects, Alternative 3 would result in a less than significant impact related to noise and vibration levels.

### **Traffic and Transportation**

Under Alternative 3, no significant impacts are anticipated on Century Park East because it would not require the removal of a lane. This alternative suggests Overland Avenue as a potential alternate route to Westwood Boulevard. This route has limitations, as it is too narrow in places and doesn't connect to the University of California at Los Angeles or the future light rail station at the intersection of Westwood Boulevard and Exposition Boulevard. Impacts anticipated under this alternative would be similar to those anticipated to occur under the proposed projects except for these two segments.

### **ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected among the alternatives that are evaluated in the EIR. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the fewest adverse impacts. If the No Project alternative is identified as environmentally superior, then another environmentally superior alternative shall be identified among the other alternatives.

As described in this chapter, similar to the proposed projects, the three build alternatives would also result in impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use, noise, and traffic and transportation. In most cases, impacts would be similar to those anticipated to occur under the proposed projects. See **Table 5-3**, above, for a comparison of impacts. Although impacts anticipated to result under Alternative 2B would be similar to the proposed projects, this alternative would result in transit impacts on one less study street (among the ones that would change under Alternative 2B) than the proposed project condition. Also, this alternative could have greater land use compatibility impacts by removing parking adjacent to neighborhood commercial – this impact would be adverse and greater than the project but still less than significant. In addition loss of parking could increase VMT as drivers look for more parking and/or drive to alternate destinations with convenient parking. However, this increased VMT would typically be off-set by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area and the impact on VMT would be considered less than significant. Alternative 2B is considered to be incrementally the environmentally superior alternative due to fewer traffic impacts.