Section 4.16

Safety and Security

This section identifies, evaluates, and characterizes existing and future safety and security issues as they relate to passengers, pedestrians, motorists, and the public. Potential safety and security impacts associated with each alternative are analyzed, and where appropriate potential mitigation and/or avoidance measures are identified. Information in this section is based on, and updated where appropriate from, the Safety and Security Technical Memorandum which is incorporated into this Draft EIS/EIR as Appendix BB.

4.16.1 Regulatory Framework/Methodology

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) does not include specific criteria for the evaluation of alternatives' effects on public safety and security; however, applicable federal regulations were reviewed for compliance and consistency.

Appendix G of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* provides guidance used to address public safety. Potential impacts exist if the project would:

- Create the potential for increased pedestrian and/or bicycle safety risks.
- Create substantial adverse safety conditions, including station accidents, boarding and disembarking accidents, ROW accidents, collisions, fires, and major structural failures.
- Substantially limit the delivery of community safety services, such as police, fire, or emergency services, to locations along the proposed alignment.
- Create the potential for adverse security conditions including incidents, offenses, and crimes.

Other safety and security regulations applicable to the proposed project include:

- Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (Map-21).
- Uniform Fire Code.
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Safety Rules and Regulations Governing Light-Rail Transit in California.
- Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) State Safety Oversight Rule.
- Metro Grade Crossing Policy for Light Rail Transit.
- California Health and Safety Code.
- Metro Rail Emergency Response Policy.
- Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria.
- National Fire Protection Association 130 Standard for Fixed Guideway Transit and Passenger Rail Systems.

More information regarding these regulations and criteria is available in Appendix BB, Safety and Security Technical Memorandum, of this Draft EIS/EIR.

Safety assessment includes consideration of potential safety conflicts for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and automobiles along the two build LRT alternative alignments. The pedestrian safety assessment of the proposed LRT corridors focused on pedestrian safety in four settings: at station sites, at park and ride facilities, in the vicinity of trackway, and at designated grade crossings.

Fire services and emergency response factors were also considered.

To evaluate security risks of the proposed alternatives, current crime statistics for areas surrounding existing Metro rail stations and major bus stops in the project area were identified and documented.

4.16.2 Affected Environment/Existing Conditions

4.16.2.1 Safety

Metro is regulated by the CPUC. In operating LRT, subways, and bus transit (including dedicated bus transitways) throughout Los Angeles County, Metro has established departments to address specific issues. One department is the Transit Education Programs Department, which works to create programs to educate the public on proper safety practices with respect to LRT. To improve the safety of passengers and pedestrians, Metro operates all transit-related vehicles according to the guidelines established by the CPUC for light rail vehicles (LRV), which include the provision of rear view mirrors, audible warning devices, and grab handles for standing passengers. The CPUC also regulates LRV braking, lighting, and operating speeds. The project area includes pedestrian infrastructure amenities to ensure pedestrian safety; these amenities include crosswalks, paths, sidewalks, and mid-block crossings. In addition, the Rail Safety Orientation Safety Program uses photos to illustrate safety practices for vehicles near rail alignments and rail crossings. Separating the tracks from street level can also reduce the potential for conflict between vehicles and LRVs. The design of any crossings would be approved by the CPUC and local public agencies, such as Los Angeles County and the city and county fire departments.

Metro's Corporate Safety Department has overall responsibility for safety on the project, extending from the planning stage through design, construction, and rail activation and into revenue service. This department would oversee system safety, fire and life safety, grade crossing safety, construction safety, and operations safety for the project. The Corporate Safety Department would also coordinate the CPUC oversight function throughout all phases of the project.

4.16.2.2 Security

Metro monitors activities and includes measures to protect security on the existing rail system, both at the stations and in the vehicles. Passengers, transit employees, vendors, contractors, and members of the general public who come in contact with the system, as well as the transit property and equipment, would be susceptible to the same crimes experienced in the neighborhoods surrounding the two build LRT alternative alignments.

Current Metro system passenger security features include closed circuit television cameras (CCTV), emergency call boxes, and fully lighted station stops and parking areas. These features are provided in all trains and buses, as well as rail stations, and are designed to offer security and a personal sense of well-being to passengers.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD) is under contract to provide full police services for stations, rail vehicles, and property belonging to Metro. These services include patrols of stations, platforms, and rail cars.

Metro and LACSD coordinate regularly, at several levels, with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Collectively, they are part of the Regional Transit Security Working Group, are members of the local Joint Terrorist Task Force, and coordinate on homeland security concerns with the area Federal Security Director for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Metro is currently in compliance with all TSA directives as well as 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1580, which requires designating a rail security coordinator and reporting significant security concerns to TSA.

4.16.3 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Consequences

Table 4.16-1 summarizes the potential safety and security impacts for each alternative.

4.16.3.1 No Build Alternative

4.16.3.1.1 Impact Analysis

The No Build Alternative would maintain the current level of transit service in the project corridor, and would therefore have no direct or indirect adverse effect under NEPA or significant impact under CEQA with regard to public safety, security, or accidents.

4.16.3.1.2 Mitigation Measures

Since the No Build Alternative would have no safety or security impacts, no mitigation measures are required.

4.16.3.1.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

There would be no adverse safety or security effects related to the No Build Alternative.

CEQA Determination

The No Build Alternative would not result in safety or security impacts.

4.16.3.2 TSM Alternative

4.16.3.2.1 Impact Analysis

Construction Impacts

Under the TSM Alternative, proposed enhancements to bus services would occur; there would be no construction in the project area associated with transit infrastructure investments. Therefore, no direct or indirect construction-related adverse effects under NEPA or significant impacts under CEQA would occur with regard to public safety, security, or accidents.

Operational Impacts

The TSM Alternative would improve upon the current level of bus transit service in the project area. The TSM Alternative would not have a detrimental or increased direct impact on public safety, security, or accidents. The TSM Alternative would not result in an adverse effect under NEPA or a significant impact under CEQA with regard to safety and security. Potential negative impacts on safety and security would be less than significant under CEQA.

Table 4.16-1. Summary of Potential Safety and Security Impacts

Alternative	Potential Effects (NEPA/CEQA)	NEPA Effects After Mitigation	CEQA Impacts After Mitigation
No Build	None	None	None
TSM	Negative indirect impact would be the "induced demand"	Not adverse	Less than significant
SR 60 LRT1	Potential adverse effects to pedestrian safety and overall security	Not adverse	Less than significant
Washington Boulevard LRT	Potential adverse effects to pedestrian safety and overall security	Not adverse	Less than significant

Notes:
[1]Results are for the SR 60 LRT Alternative as well as the SR 60 North Side Design Variation.

4.16.3.2.2 Mitigation Measures

Since the TSM Alternative would have no safety or security impacts, no mitigation measures are required.

4.16.3.2.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

There would be no adverse safety or security effects related to the TSM Alternative during construction or operation.

CEQA Determination

The TSM Alternative would not result in direct safety or security impacts during construction or operation. Potential negative indirect impacts on safety and security during operation would be less than significant.

4.16.3.3 SR 60 LRT Alternative

4.16.3.3.1 Impact Analysis

Construction Impacts

Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Motorist Safety

Potential impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and motorist safety would primarily be associated with the at-grade portion of construction activities and the overall traffic increases expected due to the delivery of construction materials, including the following:

- Intense construction activities in the center of Pomona Boulevard, from the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Atlantic Station to approximately Sadler Avenue, where the centerline of the track and columns required for the aerial configuration would begin to shift off the existing roadway system. Construction activities associated with the at-grade portion would impact residents and businesses.
- Shallow excavation and construction activity along the centerline of streets along the LRT route between stations, to install columns, track, and power facilities.
- Activities at staging and storage locations for construction equipment and materials.
- Movement of construction equipment and materials between staging and storage areas and the areas of construction.
- Heavy excavation activities in and around concrete columns that are needed to support the aerial configuration.
- Transport of debris from excavation along the haul route to the point that trucks enter the freeway and depart the community.
- Unprotected construction sites and staging areas, which may cause safety concerns if not barricaded to protect passersby from falls or other mishaps.

Emergency Response Services

Construction-related activities (i.e., roadway detours, street closures, increased traffic near emergency facilities, and construction staging) would affect the ability to provide emergency response services including medical, police, and fire. However, the SR 60 LRT Alternative Alignment is mostly aerial within the SR 60 right-of-way and not within the lanes utilized by vehicles. Therefore, use of the existing roadways by emergency vehicles would be unaffected.

Crime and Terrorist Activities

The potential for crime and terrorism during construction is primarily related to construction equipment and staging areas, as described below:

- Construction equipment stored at construction sites and staging areas may be attractive to thieves if not adequately secured.
- The visibility of construction elements from SR 60 may encourage heightened visitation from criminals into the project area.

The SR 60 LRT Alternative, including the North Side Design Variation, would result in a potential construction-related adverse effect under NEPA and a significant impact under CEQA with regard to safety and security. Mitigation, as identified below, would reduce these impacts.

Operational Impacts

The SR 60 LRT Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts to pedestrian safety and in overall security concerns during LRT operation. However, potential impacts would be less than those anticipated with the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative, mainly because the configuration of the SR 60 LRT Alternative is mostly aerial while the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative contains more at-grade elements.

Safety

Pedestrian safety at stations, designated grade crossings, and near the trackway are key factors to be considered in the design of LRT systems. This safety consideration is relevant only to the at-grade portions of the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment along Pomona Boulevard, because there would be no opportunity for pedestrians to cross tracks that run in an aerial configuration adjacent to SR 60.

For at-grade portions of the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment, a potential safety hazard would occur if the distance between designated crossings tempts pedestrians to cross the tracks at locations other than designated pedestrian crossings. In addition, potential riders who see a train approaching may attempt to cross streets and tracks illegally to avoid missing a train, in much the same way as these violations currently occur at bus stops. The single most frequent cause of motor vehicle/light rail accidents at intersections is a motorist turning left in front of an LRV that is traveling in the same direction. To reduce this risk, it is assumed that a left turn from Pomona Boulevard, or from the side streets to Pomona Boulevard, would not be permitted when LRVs are approaching the intersection from either direction. Other accidents between LRVs and motorists stem from motorists disobeying red light signals.

As part of the SR 60 LRT North Side Design Variation, the alignment would cross Greenwood Avenue, which is a restricted access roadway for the Oll landfill Superfund site. Crossing gates at this location would be included in the project's design to prevent private vehicles from crossing the tracks when trains are present.

At peak times of operation, trains are projected to run at five minute headways in each direction. This would result in a maximum of 24 trains crossing Greenwood Avenue in an hour (during non-peak hours, the headways would be greater and the number of trains per hour would be lower). Conservatively, it is estimated that vehicles would have to wait approximately 35 to 40 seconds for trains to cross Greenwood Avenue when the gates are activated. Using a conservative estimate of three seconds for each private vehicle to clear the crossing gate area, this would allow approximately 900 vehicles an hour in each direction (during peak hours) to travel safely on Greenwood Avenue with operation of the LRT.

Security

Design elements (i.e., emergency telephones, public address systems, and CCTV) and law enforcement personnel would provide a safe, secure, and comfortable transit system. Aerial portions of the SR 60 LRT Alternative require support columns, which would create shadows and hiding places along SR 60 that may add to crime problems in the area. These columns may also be conducive to graffiti. However, incorporating crime prevention efforts including, but not limited to, lighting pedestrian areas and maintaining visible areas would tend to deter criminal acts and protect transit patrons, employees, and the community from crime.

In addition, all site access to the maintenance yard would be controlled by an on-site guard and security team. Fencing would be provided around the perimeter of the maintenance yard to prevent unauthorized individuals from accessing the facility.

Operation of the SR 60 LRT Alternative, including the North Side Design Variation, would potentially result in an adverse effect under NEPA and a significant impact under CEQA with regard to safety and security. Mitigation, as identified below, would reduce these impacts.

4.16.3.3.2 Mitigation Measures

Construction Mitigation Measures

Metro will implement the following mitigation measures as they relate to the construction of the SR 60 LRT Alternative:

4.16-i. Metro would provide alternative walkways for pedestrians around construction staging areas where sidewalks currently exist, in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

4.16-ii. Metro would sign and properly mark all pedestrian and bicycle detour locations around staging sites, in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices "work zone" guidance and other applicable local and state requirements.

4.16-iii. Metro would coordinate work plans and traffic control measures with emergency responders to prevent effects on emergency response times.

4.16-iv. Metro would develop a Construction Mitigation Program during final design and implement the program during construction. The program would guide Metro in obtaining input from residents and businesses affected during construction, and in communicating with the community regarding traffic control measures, the schedule of activities, and their duration of operations.

4.16-v. Metro would coordinate with and notify the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), Montebello Unified School Dsitrict (USD), El Rancho USD, Whittier Union High/Los Nietos Elementary, Whittier Union High/Whittier City Elementary, and El Monte Union High/Valle Indo Elementary, and individual school administrators to ensure that safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools are maintained. This would include the publication and distribution of school pedestrian and bicycle route maps.

4.16-vi. Metro would provide sufficient notice to forewarn students and parents when school pedestrian and bicycle routes are affected by construction.

4.16-vii. Metro would notify LAUSD and other local unified school districts of impending impacts on existing school bus routes.

4.16-viii. Metro would inform the public, including LAUSD and other local unified school districts, of bus stops that will be abandoned or changed during or after construction of the LRT line.

4.16-ix. Metro would provide security at the construction sites and staging areas in the form of barriers at excavation sites, installation of temporary fencing, security patrols, and appropriate signage and lighting.

4.16-x. Metro would assess and coordinate with police and fire service providers prior to and during construction to share daily construction schedules and how emergency services would serve the area during periods of construction.

4.16-xi. Temporary evacuation plans would be developed by Metro and put in place for those areas that are temporarily affected by construction activities, such as the overnight closure of a roadway and/or other temporary detours that may affect evacuation plans. Additionally, public events would be taken into consideration when construction activities occur to ensure safety of workers, participants, Metro patrons, and other members of the public.

Operational Mitigation Measures

All proposed mitigation measures regarding safety and security would be developed in conformance with Metro's *Rail Transit Design Criteria and Standards, Fire/Life Safety Criteria, Volume IX*. These criteria specifically address fire protection requirements for the design and construction of LRT systems. The criteria identify and discuss fire safety as it corresponds to the following specific design criteria: station and guideway facilities, passenger vehicles, vehicle and maintenance yards, system fire/life safety procedures, communications, rail operations control, and inspection, maintenance, and training. The criteria establish minimum requirements that would provide for the protection of life and property from the effects of fire. Proposed safety and security mitigation recommendations would be based on the results of, and become a part of, the Threat and Vulnerability Assessment that will be conducted for the locally preferred alternative when one is selected. These security measures may include:

- A CCTV system.
- Emergency push-button call system for patrons.
- Intrusion detection system.
- Dedicated security patrol protocols and procedures.
- Employing "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" principles during the design phase.

The following mitigation measures apply to at-grade or aerial portions of the SR 60 LRT Alternative alignment:

4.16-xii. To reduce the risk of collisions between LRVs and automobiles on the street portion of the proposed alignments, Metro would coordinate with the CPUC, the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and its traffic and lighting division, and the city and county fire departments, and would also comply with the Federal Highway Administration's *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* for signing and pavement marking treatments.

4.16-xiii. Metro would ensure that all stations would be lighted to avoid/minimize shadows, and all pedestrian pathways leading to/from sidewalks and parking facilities would be well illuminated. In addition, lighting would provide excellent visibility for train operators to be able to react to possible conflicts, especially with pedestrians crossing the track.

4.16-xiv. Metro's proposed station designs would not include design elements that obstruct visibility or observation or provide discrete locations favorable to crime; pedestrian access to at-grade stations would be at ground level with clear sight lines.

4.16-xv. Sidewalk widths and placements would be designed appropriately by Metro to accommodate a wide variety of users. In areas directly adjacent to the rail stations: 1) sidewalk widths would be designed using the widest dimensions feasible, in conformance with Metro's adopted "Land Use/Transportation Policy," and with widths exceeding ten feet; 2) minimum widths would not be

less than those allowed by the State of California Title 24 access requirements of 48 inches, or the ADA design recommendations of 60 inches; 3) accommodating pedestrian movements and flows would take priority over other transportation improvements, including automobile access; and 4) physical improvements would ensure that all stations are fully accessible, as defined in the ADA.

4.16-xvi. Adequate pedestrian queuing and refuge areas and wide crosswalks would be provided by Metro in areas immediately around proposed stations and park and ride facilities to promote pedestrian safety and mobility.

4.16-xvii. The Metro Fire/Life Safety Committee has developed standard safety-related design criteria to ensure adequate LRT operation in and around LRT stations. These include: 1) fire alarm protection within the station area, 2) a minimum of two fire emergency routes from each proposed station, 3) emergency ventilation and lighting, 4) communication systems between adjoining fire agencies, and 5) a methane detection system for each proposed station.

4.16-xviii. Metro would ensure that building construction for stations would not be less than Type I Construction as defined in the Uniform Building Code (UBC). For portions of the alignment where pedestrians and/or motor vehicles must cross the tracks, Metro would design crossings in accordance with CPUC and local public agency requirements.

4.16-xix. All proposed LRT stations and related park and ride facilities would be equipped with monitoring equipment and/or be monitored by Metro security personnel on a regular basis.

4.16-xx. Metro would implement a security plan for LRT operations. The plan would include both in-car and station surveillance by Metro security or other local jurisdiction security personnel.

4.16-xxi. Prior to project opening, Metro would coordinate and consult with the LACSD and local municipal police departments to develop safety and security plans for the proposed alignment, park and ride facilities, and station areas.

4.16-xxii. Metro would continue to provide security services to cover the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project.

4.16-xxiii. Fire separations would be provided and maintained by Metro in public occupancy areas. Station public occupancy would be separated from station ancillary occupancy by a minimum 2-hour fire-rated wall. The only exception is that a maximum of two station agents, supervisors, or information booths may be located within station public occupancy areas when constructed of approved non-combustible materials and limited in floor area to 100 square feet.

4.16-xxiv. The diverse needs of different types of travelers, including students, senior citizens, disabled citizens, and low-income citizens, would be addressed through a formal educational and outreach campaign conducted by Metro prior to and during project operation. The campaign would target these diverse community members to educate them on proper system use and benefits of riding LRT.

4.16-xxv. Metro would control all site access to maintenance yard(s) with an on-site guard and security team. Metro would place fencing around the perimeter of the maintenance yard(s) to prevent unauthorized individuals from accessing them. The yard(s) would also include adequate lighting throughout.

4.16.3.3.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

The SR 60 LRT Alternative, including the North Side Design Variation, would not have adverse effects on safety and security during construction or operation after proposed mitigation measures are implemented.

CEQA Determination

The SR 60 LRT Alternative, including the North Side Design Variation, would not have significant impacts on safety and security during construction or operation after proposed mitigation measures are implemented.

4.16.3.4 Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative

4.16.3.4.1 Impact Analysis

Construction Impacts

Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Motorist Safety

Construction-related activities that may affect pedestrian, bicycle, and motorist safety include:

- Intense construction activities in the center of several existing streets would occur, beginning with the connection to the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Atlantic Station. Aerial elements would be supported at various locations either by columns straddling both sides of the street or by single columns, and at-grade portions along Washington Boulevard would also see intense construction activity. Both types of activities would impact residents and businesses.
- Shallow excavation and construction activity along the centerline of streets or at sidewalks along the LRT route between stations to install columns, track, and power facilities.
- Activities at staging and storage locations of construction equipment and materials.
- Movement of construction equipment and materials between staging and storage areas and the areas of construction.
- Heavy excavation activities in and around concrete columns that are needed to support the aerial configuration.
- Transport of debris from excavation along the haul route to the point that trucks enter the freeway and depart the community.
- Unprotected construction sites and staging areas may cause safety concerns if not barricaded to protect passersby from falls or other potential concerns.

Emergency Response Services

Construction activities (i.e., roadway detours, street closures, increased traffic near emergency facilities, and construction staging) would affect the ability to provide emergency response services including medical, police, and fire. At-grade segments along Washington Boulevard have the greatest potential to disrupt emergency service response times, especially with the cluster of medical services near the terminus of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment at Lambert Road.

Crime and Terrorist Activities

The potential for crime and terrorism during construction is related primarily to construction equipment and staging areas, as described below:

- Construction equipment stored at construction sites and staging areas may be attractive to thieves if not adequately secured.

- The visibility of construction elements may encourage heightened visitation from criminals into the project area.

Perceived high gang activity both in the industrial area and in residential and commercial areas north and south of Washington Boulevard would merit additional consideration during construction activities to ensure that emergency response times are not compromised.

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would potentially result in a construction-related adverse effect under NEPA and a significant impact under CEQA with regard to safety and security.

Operational Impacts

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts to pedestrian safety and in overall security concerns during LRT operation, similar to those described for the SR 60 LRT Alternative; however, the impacts have the potential to affect a much larger geographic area and influence more existing streets. This is predominantly because a substantial portion of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment is at-grade.

Safety

Pedestrian safety at stations, designated grade crossings, and near the trackway are key factors to be considered in the design of LRT systems. This pedestrian crossing safety consideration is relevant only to the at-grade portions of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment because there would be no opportunity for pedestrians to cross tracks that run on an aerial structure.

Toward the eastern half of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative, the alignment would transition from aerial to at-grade. Pedestrian safety is a concern particularly near Rio Vista Elementary School, El Rancho High School, Rivera Elementary School and Middle School, Pioneer High School, Nelson Elementary School, Brethren Christian Private School, and Washington Elementary School, where many students walk to and from the facility. Large numbers of students and other pedestrians typically cross the at-grade rail tracks or run to catch the train at station platforms, violating warning signs. Pedestrian treatments (such as barriers), adequate sidewalk widths, and channelization techniques would be implemented to control pedestrian mobility at intersections, minimize inappropriate crossing behaviors, and encourage the use of designated pedestrian crossings.

Impacts related to pedestrian safety may be less for the Rosemead Boulevard aerial crossing and San Gabriel River/I-605 aerial crossing options than for the at-grade options at these locations, since an aerial configuration eliminates potential pedestrian crossings. This concept also applies to the Rosemead Boulevard station and adjacent park and ride/TOD facilities. If the Rosemead Boulevard aerial crossing design variation is selected, the station would be an aerial center platform station accessible from either side of the street, which would reduce the potential for conflict between LRVs and pedestrians to less than that of the at-grade configuration.

At-grade segments along Washington Boulevard also have the greatest potential to disrupt emergency service response times, especially with the cluster of medical services and the Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital near the terminus of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative alignment at Lambert Road. The single most frequent cause of motor vehicle/light rail accidents at intersections is a motorist turning left in front of an LRV traveling in the same direction. To reduce this risk, it is assumed that left turns from existing streets with the at-grade alignment, or from the side streets to the street with the at-grade alignment, would not be permitted when LRVs are approaching the intersection from either direction. Other accidents between LRVs and motorists stem from motorists disobeying red light signals.

Security

Perceived high gang activity in the industrial and residential and commercial areas of Washington Boulevard would merit design considerations (i.e., emergency telephones, public address systems, and CCTV) and law enforcement personnel to ensure a safe, secure, and comfortable transit system. Aerial portions of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative require support columns, which may be targets for graffiti. However, incorporation of crime prevention measures including, but not limited to, lighting pedestrian areas and maintaining visible areas would tend to deter criminal acts and protect transit patrons, employees, and the community from crime. Stations would also have covered waiting platforms and secure lighting.

In addition, all site access to the maintenance yard(s) would be controlled by an on-site guard and security team. Fencing would be provided around the perimeter of the maintenance yard(s) to prevent access by unauthorized individuals.

Operation of the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would potentially result in an adverse effect under NEPA and a significant impact under CEQA with regard to safety and security.

4.16.3.4.2 Mitigation Measures

Construction Mitigation Measures

The same mitigation measures (mitigation measures 4.16-i through 4.16-xi) identified above in Section 4.16.3.3.2 for the SR 60 LRT Alternative and summarized in Table ES-2 would also apply to this alternative.

Operational Mitigation Measures

The same mitigation measures (mitigation measures 4.16-xii through 4.16-xxv) identified above in Section 4.16.3.3.2 for the SR 60 LRT Alternative and summarized in Table ES-2 would also apply to this alternative.

4.16.3.4.3 Impacts Remaining After Mitigation

NEPA Finding

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not have adverse effects on safety and security during construction or operation with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

CEQA Determination

The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would not have significant impacts on safety and security during construction or operation with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

This page intentionally left blank.