3.15 Transportation

This section evaluates the potential long-term effects of the No Build Alternative and the Build Alternative on transportation, as detailed in **Appendix O** (Transportation Impacts Report). Short term construction effects are discussed in **Section 3.17** (Construction).

The assessment of reasonably foreseeable effects in this section is based upon the temporal proximity parameters detailed in **Chapter 3.0** (Introduction), and the geographic proximity parameters defined in **Section 3.15.1** (Affected Environment).

3.15.1 Affected Environment

The Study Area is the 0.5-mile to 2-mile radius from the guideway centerline described in **Section 3.1.1**. This Study Area encompasses the transit and transportation network, pedestrian and bicycle circulation and emergency access that could be affected by the Project. The evaluation of local transportation, parking, emergency access, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation near the proposed stations and MSF site options focuses on the portion of the Study Area within a 0.25 mile radius of the proposed stations and MSF site options.

Regulations for transportation applicable to the Project are summarized in **Appendix S** (Regulatory Setting Summary) and detailed in **Appendix O**. Data sources used for this analysis include the Corridor Based Model 2018 (CBM18), intersection traffic counts (January 2025), roadway segment vehicle counts (by vehicle class) (January 2025), Southern California Association of Government's 2016 RTP, Southern California Association of Government's 2024 RTP, ridership data from Metro, Metrolink, Caltrans, the City of Montebello, the City of Commerce, and Los Angeles County Public Works, and the Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan.

3.15.1.1 Methodology

Ridership forecasts, VMT estimates, and other travel demand modeling projections used in this analysis are based on the outputs of the CBM18. The base-year data in the CBM18 are from 2017 and represent the most recent available data when the model was created in 2018. The CBM18 was updated and refined specifically for use in this study to include major roadway and transit improvements expected to be completed by 2042. The travel demand modeling analysis includes Metro Measure M projects identified in the Measure M Expenditure Plan. The Metro Measure M projects are to be completed by the forecast year, as included in the CBM18. Similarly, any roadway improvement projects specified by jurisdictions are included in the travel demand modeling analysis. An analysis of mode shift resulting from the Build Alternative considered several key factors, including new transit riders, station access, travel times and delay, shifts from auto to rail, service levels, and VMT. See **Appendix O** for additional information.

The Transportation analysis evaluates the following topics:

- **Transit:** Transit services in the Study Area
  - Metro Rail E Line (Maravilla, East Los Angeles Civic Center, and Atlantic Stations)
  - Metrolink (Montebello/Commerce Station)
  - Metro and other jurisdictional bus lines
- **Transportation Network:** Regional freeway network and arterial network of major north/south and east/west roadways
- **Pedestrian Circulation:** Sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian facilities near the proposed stations and in the Study Area
- **Parking:** Off-street and on-street parking facilities near the proposed stations
  - Spillover parking during operations is analyzed for the surrounding areas around proposed stations

- **Bicycle Circulation:** Class I through Class IV bicycle facilities and bicycle parking near the proposed stations and in the Study Area
- **Emergency Access:** Emergency access facilities within the Study Area, including police stations, fire departments, and hospitals
  - State Route 60 and Interstate 5 are identified as primary disaster routes
  - Beverly Boulevard, Garfield Avenue, Washington Boulevard are identified as secondary disaster routes for the Los Angeles County Operational Area

3.15.2 No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative, as described in **Section 2.2** (No Build Alternative) of the EA, would include already planned and funded roadway and transit projects but would not provide a rail transit option for communities in eastern Los Angeles County. The No Build Alternative would not involve any new construction, major service improvements or new transportation infrastructure beyond what is listed in Metro's 2020 LRTP, Southern California Association of Governments, 2024 RTP, and Measure M. The No Build Alternative would result in a continuation of current development patterns and trends. However, the No Build Alternative would not provide the transportation benefits typical of high-capacity transit projects, including encouragement of mode shift to transit and/or active transportation from personal automobiles. While highway and transit improvements would occur, Metro's LRTP predicts that traffic would continually worsen in the absence of additional transportation capacity. Therefore, the No Build Alternative would contribute to deteriorating access and mobility within Eastern Los Angeles County. Without improved transit options and connections to the regional transit network, the opportunities for transit-supportive and pedestrian-oriented development would be limited in the region.

The City of Montebello and the City of Commerce's General Plans list support of the Build Alternative. The Build Alternative is included within Metro's LRTP with funding allocated through Measure M. Therefore, the No Build Alternative would result in an adverse impact as it would conflict with Metro's LRTP and the City of Montebello and the City of Commerce's General Plans. Further, under the No Build Alternative, the adopted plans, policies, and regulations that include the Build Alternative encourage circulation improvements, community access and development, and air pollutant emissions reductions would not be supported. Overall, as shown in **Table 3.15-1**, the No Build Alternative would not fulfill or support the transportation-related objectives found in regional plans and in the general plans of the local jurisdictions because it would not integrate major transportation facilities with future land use planning. The No Build Alternative would result in increased local roadway congestion impacts on bus transit as well as arterial and freeway congestion impacts on vehicle travel that would worsen under population and employment growth for the area; there would be a long-term adverse effect.

Table 3.15-1 Transportation Impact Summary – No Build Alternative

Topic	Impact	Rationale
Transit	Adverse Effect	▪ Inconsistent with Metro's LRTP, Metro Measure M funding, and individual corridor jurisdictions' General Plans that list support of the Eastside Phase 2 Project ▪ Would not provide the regional transportation benefits typical of high-capacity transit projects, including encouragement of mode shift to transit to lower regional VMT
Regional Transportation	Adverse Effect	▪ Inconsistent with Metro's LRTP, Metro Measure M funding, and individual corridor jurisdictions' General Plans that list support of the Eastside Phase 2 Project ▪ Would not provide the regional transportation benefits typical of high-capacity transit projects, including encouragement of mode shift to transit to lower regional VMT ▪ Increase in vehicle traffic and congestion is projected to result in a decrease in average vehicle speeds of 9 percent in the region
Local Roadway Circulation	Adverse Effect	▪ Inconsistent with Metro's LRTP, Metro Measure M funding, and individual corridor jurisdictions' General Plans that list support of the Eastside Phase 2 Project ▪ Local population and employment growth would result in increased local roadway congestion
Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation	No Adverse Effect	▪ No known planned and approved projects that would alter the pedestrian or bicycle circulation from their existing configuration
Emergency Access	No Adverse Effect	▪ No known planned and approved projects that would alter emergency access from its existing conditions or create safety hazards in the Study Area

Source: Metro; CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026.
Key: LRTP = Long Range Transportation Plan; VMT = Vehicle Miles Traveled

3.15.3 Build Alternative

3.15.3.1 Transit

The Build Alternative would provide transit travel time savings compared to the No Build Alternative. Travel time for bus service between the Atlantic/Pomona station and Greenwood station would be 24 minutes and 17 minutes by automobile. In comparison, the Build Alternative light rail transit service would have a travel time of less than 8 minutes. **Table 3.15-2** shows the total travel time between the stations by bus service and automobile with and without the Build Alternative. Atlantic/Pomona station and Greenwood station, which would have a travel time savings of 9 and 16 minutes compared to the No Build Alternative.

Table 3.15-2 Build Alternative Travel Time Comparison – Average Travel Time between Proposed Stations

Stations	No Build Alternative Average Automobile Travel Time (minutes)	No Build Alternative Average Peak Bus Travel Time (minutes)[1]	Build Alternative Average Peak Light Rail Transit Travel Time (minutes)[2]
Atlantic/Pomona - Atlantic/Whittier	4.2	6.9	2.3
Atlantic/Whittier - Commerce/Citadel	4.5	5.1	2.4
Commerce/Citadel - Greenwood	7.9	12.4	3.2
Atlantic/Pomona - Greenwood	16.6	24.4	7.9

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026, ***Appendix O****.*

Notes: Average travel times are average of both directions in minutes.

There is no existing or planned direct transit service between Atlantic/Pomona and Greenwood stations.

[1] Travel times from 2050 No Build Alternative peak-period model run, average of both directions of travel.

[2] Travel times from 2050 Build Alternative peak-period model run.

The Build Alternative would support several regional and local plans and policies and would not conflict with adopted regional or local policies or plans (**Table 3.15-1**). The Build Alternative would also enhance transit connectivity between the stations and the surrounding areas and encourage mode shift to transit, and thereby increase ridership countywide when compared to the No Build Alternative. Therefore, the Build Alternative would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to transit operations.

MSF Sites 1, 2, and 3 would not conflict with local or regional transit operations or with adopted regional or local policies or plans. The transition from Washington Boulevard to MSF Sites 1 and 2 would be in an aerial configuration, and there would be no delay to roadway traffic when a light rail vehicle makes the turn from Washington Boulevard to MSF Site 1 or 2. The lead tracks to MSF Site 3 would occur as the underground alignment transitions to the aerial alignment and there would be no delay in roadway traffic. No transit routes operate on Saybrook Avenue, Gayhart Street, Acco Street or Yates Avenue. Therefore, MSF Site 1, 2, or 3 would not result in a long-term adverse effect.

3.15.3.2 Transportation Network

Table 3.15-3 compares the estimated average daily VMT, vehicle hours traveled, number of vehicle trips, and average vehicle speeds for the No Build Alternative and the Build Alternative. As shown in **Table 3.15-3**, the Build Alternative would result in 8,000 reduced VMT daily and 1,000 reduced vehicle hours traveled compared to the No Build Alternative in the 2050 horizon year. Therefore, the Build Alternative would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to the regional transportation network.

Table 3.15-3 Regional Transportation in 2050 Horizon Year – Build Alternative versus No Build Alternative

Region-wide Statistics	2050 with No Build	2050 with Build Alternative	Change	Percent (%) Change
Vehicle Miles Traveled	577,229,000	577,221,000	-8,000	0.00%
Vehicle Hours Traveled	19,247,000	19,246,000	-1,000	-0.01%
Average Vehicle Speed (miles per hour)	30	30	0	0.00%
am Peak Vehicle Trips	9,707,000	9,706,000	-1,000	-0.01%
pm Peak Vehicle Trips	12,956,000	12,955,000	-1,000	-0.01%

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026, ***Appendix O****.*

Key: am = ante meridiem; pm = post meridiem

The operation of MSF Site 1, 2, or 3 (e.g., maintenance workers commuting to and from the MSF and truck delivery of goods, services, or equipment) would not result in an increase in VMT as the MSF Site would involve a light industrial use (transit fleet maintenance) taking place at an infill site within an established light industrial district. The MSF would provide critical functions for the daily operation and maintenance of the proposed transit service. Thus, the VMT reductions with operation of the proposed transit service would not be possible without the MSF, and those VMT reductions would offset any operational VMT attributable to the MSF. Measures to address changes to traffic circulation would be implemented as described in NPM TRA-1 (Operational Best Management Practices for Transportation). The MSF, therefore, would not generate different VMT characteristics than the surrounding existing uses such that it could result in an adverse effect related to VMT. Therefore, operation of MSF Site 1, 2, or 3 would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to regional transportation network.

3.15.3.3 Local Roadway Circulation

Components of the Build Alternative and the MSF would include new traffic signals or modifications to existing traffic signals to accommodate light rail movements and traffic circulation patterns at intersections, enhancements to existing signalized crosswalks, and bicycle circulation and access amenities in immediate station areas. The Build Alternative would result in a reduction of general-purpose travel lanes (two to one lane on 3rd Street in the eastbound direction between Civic Center Way and the new Sheriff's Department access road and from three to two lanes in each direction along Washington Boulevard between Saybrook Avenue and Carob Way) and elimination of left turns (3rd Street and La Verne Avenue and 3rd Steet and Civic Center Way as well as ingress/egress movements at driveways and selected cross streets along Washington Boulevard. As identified in NPM TRA-1, the Build Alternative would not preclude vehicle or truck access along Washington Boulevard (and therefore driveway access would be maintained), and left-turn movements would continue to be allowed to and from major cross-streets (e.g., Garfield Avenue, Greenwood Avenue) at signalized intersections. Although the Build Alternative would result in a reduction of three to two in travel lanes in each direction along Washington Boulevard that would shift travel patterns along the corridor, the 1 mile segment along Washington Boulevard would still have signalized intersections for vehicles to turn around and get to their destination with minimal backtracking. MSF Sites 1, 2, and 3 would involve only minor changes to traffic circulation, including new or modified driveways. Additionally, if MSF Site 1 is selected, Acco Street would be closed to through access, and a cul-de-sac would be constructed on the westerly side of the lead tracks. The closure of Acco Street to through traffic would have a negligible effect on traffic circulation. Changes to traffic circulation would be designed according to applicable standards and criteria.

The purpose of the Build Alternative is to improve transportation and mobility in the area. As shown in **Table 3.15-2**, the improved transit access and travel times would result in a beneficial effect on transit users in the Study Area. Furthermore, the Build Alternative would not take away a transportation use, but instead would repurpose vehicle travel lanes for transit-only use. This increased transit use would reduce overall VMT, providing a beneficial effect. Therefore, operation of the Build Alternative would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to local roadway circulation.

Table 3.15-4 shows all the intersections that operate at Level of Service (LOS) E/F or degrade LOS between the No Build Alternative and Build Alternative. The increases in delay for the intersections listed along Washington Boulevard are due to the reduction in travel lanes along this corridor under the Build Alternative. Other intersections along Atlantic Boulevard could experience minor delays of less than 1 second per vehicle. The potential delay at intersection number 8 (Woods Avenue/Beverly Boulevard/3rd Street/Pomona Boulevard) would increase by 64 seconds per vehicle (21 percent increase) in the am peak period due to slight increase in traffic detours under the Build Alternative, but this intersection operates at LOS F under both the No Build Alternative and the Build Alternative and in both am and pm peak hours. The potential delays could result from the new guideway and roadway configuration, which includes northbound lane and westbound lane closures and intersection configuration change at intersection number 8 (3rd Street/Pomona Boulevard). The intersection operates at LOS F in both am and pm peak periods under the No Build Alternative.

As shown in **Table 3.15-4,** under the Build Alternative, intersection number 34 (Vail Avenue and Washington Boulevard) operates at LOS F in both am and pm peak periods and would have a delay increase of 19 seconds in the pm peak period because of an increase in traffic from detours. The potential delays could result from the eastbound lane and westbound lane closures at intersection number 35 (Washington and Maple) with LOS A, and eastbound/westbound lane reductions along Washington Boulevard. This only represents a 3 percent increase in vehicle delay compared to No Build Alternative.

The Build Alternative would result in a single intersection (Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard) to move from Level of Service D to Level of Service E in the pm peak due to the reduction in travel lanes on Washington Boulevard. The reduction of the Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard intersection level of service from Level of Service D to Level of Service E in the pm peak period would be an adverse effect. NMM TRA-1 (Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard Intersection) would require one through lane to be converted into a left-turn lane and the right-turn lane to be reconfigured at Intersection #32 (Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard) to optimize this intersection's cycle length and splits; as shown in **Table 3.15-5**, this mitigation would improve the level of service at Intersection #32 so that it operates at Level of Service D in both the am and pm peak periods. With the implementation of NMM TRA-1, there would be no long-term adverse effect.

Table 3.15-4 The No Build Alternative and Build Alternative (2050) Conditions LOS Analysis

#	Intersection	No Build Alternative				Build Alternative			
		am Peak Hour		pm Peak Hour		am Peak Hour		pm Peak Hour	
		Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle)	LOS	Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle)	LOS	Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle)	LOS	Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle)	LOS
8	Woods Ave and Beverly Blvd and 3rd Street/Pomona Blvd	**311.3**	**F**	**702.0**	**F**	**375.9**	**F**	**705.8**	**F**
11	Atlantic Blvd and Beverly Blvd	**45.7**	**D**	**55.8**	**E**	**45.3**	**D**	**55.4**	**E**
14	Atlantic Blvd and Eagle Street	14.8	B	11.2	B	15.4	B	11.5	B
17	Ferris Avenue and Whittier Blvd	10.3	B	9.9	A	10.5	B	10.1	B
24	Atlantic Blvd and Triggs Street/Goodrich Blvd and Telegraph Road/Ferguson Drive	**123.3**	**F**	**129.1**	**F**	**123.3**	**F**	**128.5**	**F**
26	Vail Avenue and Mines Avenue	29.4	D	**62.4**	**F**	28.8	D	**62.4**	**F**
27	Garfield Avenue and Flotilla Street	18.9	B	**74.5**	**E**	18.7	B	**74.3**	**E**
31	Gayhart Street and Washington Blvd	5.4	A	8.6	A	6.4	A	10.0	B
32	Garfield Avenue and Washington Blvd	42.9	D	54.9	D	46.3	D	**60.7**	**E**
34	Vail Avenue and Washington Blvd	**263.7**	**F**	**619.6**	**F**	**268.0**	**F**	**638.3**	**F**
36	Greenwood Avenue and Washington Blvd	12.3	B	15.6	B	28.2	C	40.1	D
37	Montebello Blvd and Washington Blvd	8.6	A	5.5	A	17.0	B	7.2	A

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026, ***Appendix O****.*
Notes: **Boldface** type indicates that the intersection operates at LOS (LOS E/F).
Key: LOS = Level of Service

Table 3.15-5 Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard Intersection Analysis with Mitigation

Intersection	Traffic Control Type	am Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle)	am Level of Service	pm Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle)	pm Level of Service
Build Alternative Without Mitigation	Signal	46.3	D	60.7	E
Build Alternative With Mitigation	Signal	51.0	D	54.6	D

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026, ***Appendix O****.*
Key: am = ante meridiem; pm = post meridiem

The projected maximum vehicle queues at all analyzed freeway off-ramps would not exceed the available queuing space during either the weekday am or pm peak hours, except at Interstate 5 northbound Ramps/ Woods Avenue and Telegraph Road (Intersection #23). However, the projected maximum vehicle queues at all analyzed freeway off-ramps would remain within the overall available queuing space during both the weekday am and pm peak hours, and the projected vehicle queues would not back up into the freeway mainline. Therefore, the Build Alternative would not result in any long-term adverse effects on local roadway circulation (and off-ramp queue delay).

3.15.3.4 Parking

Table 3.15-6 displays the existing and proposed parking supply adjacent to the proposed station locations. The Build Alternative would require the removal and displacement of existing off-street parking facilities to accommodate operation of the stations, associated parking facilities, and the physical track structure. For off-street parking spaces that are associated with full takes of parcels and their businesses, the demand for these spaces would be eliminated as well. As such, there would be no adverse effects on off-street parking with the full removal of these parcels. Similarly, at the Commerce/Citadel station, the main operation of The Citadel would be maintained, and replacement parking spaces will be situated elsewhere within the property. With existing parking management methods deployed at the Citadel, such as valet parking, shuttles, remote parking, employee parking programs, as well as a reduction in parking demand due to new transit access provided by the Build Alternative, there would be no adverse effects on off-street parking at this site. MSF Sites 1, 2, and 3 would provide sufficient on-site parking for employees, and no operational spillover parking effects on off-street or on-street parking facilities would occur. As such, the MSF would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to off-street parking. **Appendix O** provides more information regarding the number of parking spaces anticipated to be affected by the Build Alternative.

Table 3.15-6 Station Parking (Existing and Build Alternative)

Intersection	Existing Off-Street Parking	Build Alternative Parking
Atlantic/Pomona	Public parking facility and surface lot providing 280 paid public parking spaces.	Utilize the existing parking facility located north of the 3rd Street and Atlantic Boulevard intersection.
Atlantic/Whittier	Private surface parking lots serving adjacent commercial properties. No public parking facility.	None
Commerce/Citadel	Private surface parking lots serving Citadel Outlets, private offices, hotels, and adjacent businesses. No public parking facility.	75 parking spaces would be removed and relocated near the Commerce/Citadel station. The main operation of the Citadel would be maintained, and replacement parking spaces situated elsewhere within the property.
Greenwood	Private surface parking lots serving adjacent commercial properties. No public parking facility.	New parking facility with 270-370 dedicated station parking spaces to be located on southwest corner of this intersection.

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026, ***Appendix O****.*

3.15.3.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

Project design would maintain adequate sidewalk widths along aerial portions of the alignment and at station locations. Additional enhancements to existing signalized crosswalks, such as continental crosswalks, would further improve pedestrian circulation and non-motorized access to transit stations as identified in NPM TRA-1.

Overall, the Build Alternative would enhance walkability in the immediate vicinity of the proposed station areas and include improvements coordinated with the local jurisdictions. For the at-grade portion of the alignment within Montebello, narrow sidewalk widths (5 to 8 feet compared to 12 feet for the aerial configuration in Commerce) would be required to accommodate the at-grade track alignment along Washington Boulevard. The adjustment in sidewalk width would occur along Washington Boulevard from 620 feet west of Vail Avenue to the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Vail Avenue. These narrow sidewalks would still meet the Americans with Disabilities Act minimum requirements and would not conflict with any identified local programs, plans, or policies. Therefore, the Build Alternative would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to pedestrian circulation.

The City of Montebello has proposed bicycle facilities along Flotilla Street and Vail Avenue along the perimeter roadways of MSF Sites 1 and 2. For MSF Site 3, there are no existing or proposed bicycle facilities on the perimeter roadways (Gayhart Street and Saybrook Avenue) and the MSF would operate within the existing industrial parcel. The potential for conflicts between bicyclists and light rail transit operations would be minimal or non-existent and the proposed bicycle facilities would not conflict nor be blocked by MSF Site 1, 2, or 3 during operations. Therefore, operation of the MSF, no matter which site is selected, would not result in an adverse effect related to bicycle circulation. The industrial areas around MSF Sites 1, 2, and 3 have limited pedestrian and bicycle activity. No plans or programs are approved that will expand or enhance the pedestrian network immediately surrounding the MSF sites; therefore, removing sidewalks in the area around the MSF sites would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to pedestrian circulation during operations.

3.15.3.6 Emergency Access

Operation of the Build Alternative would potentially result in an increase in fire and police protection response times as a result of response delays at new grade crossings if the emergency response vehicle arrives at the same time as a train; however, emergency response times would remain at acceptable levels due to the short length of the light rail transit trainsets and the short time required for light rail transit vehicles to enter and exit the crossings and with implementation of the standard coordination and design practices identified above and in NPM TRA-1 (as shown in **Table 3.15-5**, including compliance with code requirements pertaining to emergency vehicle access and building standards also ensure that response times are maintained at acceptable levels). Additionally, Metro will coordinate with fire and police officials when designing grade crossings to maintain access for police and fire protection services. As a result, operation of the Build Alternative would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to emergency access.

MSF Sites 1, 2, and 3 would be in proximity to the core of the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area and would involve light industrial uses (transit fleet storage, service repair and maintenance) at an infill site within an established light industrial district. Changes to traffic circulation would be implemented as described in NPM TRA-1. Emergency responders would still have priority to pass through an intersection with the siren on; given that trains would be operating in exclusive street-running ROW at these locations, it would be possible for trains to clear signaled and unsignalized intersections quickly to allow emergency vehicles to pass. Therefore, response times would remain acceptable. The MSF site options would include changes to traffic circulation, such as new or modified driveways; however, these changes would be designed according to applicable state, Metro, and local design criteria and standards as identified in NPM TRA-3 (Operational Best Management Practices for the Maintenance and Storage Facility Regarding Transportation). As such, operation of MSF Site 1, 2, or 3 would not result in a long-term adverse effect related to emergency access.

3.15.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures for the Build Alternative

The measures identified in **Table 3.15-7** would be implemented for the Build Alternative in the long term. Construction measures are provided in **Section 3.17**.

Table 3.15-7 Long-Term Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures

Topic	Potential Effect	Proposed Measure	Measure Type	Effects After Implementation of Measure(s)
Regional Transportation, Local Roadway Circulation, Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation, and Emergency Access	Potential regional transportation, local roadway circulation, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and emergency access effects during operation of the Build Alternative.	**NPM TRA-1 (Operational Best Management Practices for Transportation).** Operational best management practices (BMP) for the Project shall include the following: ▪ Sidewalks shall not be altered to the extent that pedestrian circulation would be impaired or in violation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. ▪ Additional enhancements to the existing signalized crosswalks, such as marked crosswalks and lighting, shall further improve pedestrian circulation and non-motorized access to transit stations. ▪ Metro shall coordinate with local jurisdictions to enhance walkability in the immediate vicinity of the proposed station areas. ▪ Operation of the Project shall not conflict with any identified local programs, plans, or policies for circulation elements in coordination with local jurisdictions. ▪ New traffic signals or modifications to existing traffic signals (e.g., signal phasing changes) to accommodate light rail movements, traffic circulation patterns at intersections, grade crossings, and to facilitate pedestrian access to/from stations (e.g., mid-block crossings at stations) shall be designed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) and standards. ▪ Bicycle circulation and access amenities shall be provided in the immediate station areas. Amenities may include bike parking and connections to existing nearby bike facilities within up to a 600-foot radius to improve bicycle-to-transit connections, and shall be determined during preliminary engineering. ▪ Proposed bicycle facilities that intersect the Project at applicable intersections shall remain accessible and allow bicyclists and pedestrians to cross at those intersections. ▪ Project operations shall not preclude vehicle or truck access along Washington Boulevard, and left-turn movements shall continue to be allowed to and from major cross-streets (e.g., Garfield Avenue, Greenwood Avenue) at signalized intersections. ▪ Stations and grade crossings shall be designed in accordance with the MRDC, including Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria, to ensure safety and minimize potential hazards at all locations.	Project Measure	**No Adverse Effect** - Operational best management practices for the Build Alternative would be implemented

Topic	Potential Effect	Proposed Measure	Measure Type	Effects After Implementation of Measure(s)
		▪ The Project shall be operated per applicable State, Metro, and city design criteria and standards, including adherence to design codes and standards such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), California Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Metro safety and security programs and standards (i.e., MRDC and Metro Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy), and building standards to ensure emergency vehicle access and response times are maintained at acceptable levels. ▪ Best practice safety measures shall be implemented to minimize potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Measures may include mid-block crosswalks, signal-protected pedestrian movements, channelization, barriers high visibility curbs between the guideway and roadway to prohibit vehicles from driving onto the tracks, barriers to protect and route pedestrians, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and warning signs to provide for convenient and safe access to station platforms. ▪ Uncontrolled mid-block vehicular crossings of tracks and mid-block left-turns shall not be permitted and shall be physically prohibited by a curb between the roadway and at-grade guideway with a fence between the two tracks in the center of the guideway whenever feasible. ▪ Grade crossings shall include traffic signal coordination and upgrades in accordance with MRDC to avoid conflicts between light rail vehicles (LRV) traffic along Washington Boulevard. ▪ Vehicular and pedestrian crossings across the at-grade segments of the alignment shall be limited to intersections controlled by traffic signals.		

Topic	Potential Effect	Proposed Measure	Measure Type	Effects After Implementation of Measure(s)
Emergency Access	Potential emergency access effects during operation of the MSF.	**NPM TRA-3 (Operational Best Management Practices for the Maintenance and Storage Facility Regarding Transportation)**. Operational best management practices (BMP) for the maintenance and storage facility (MSF) include the following: ▪ Access shall be maintained to properties to the west of the vacated portion of Acco Street via Yates Avenue (for MSF Site 1). Access shall be maintained on Yates Avenue (for MSF Site 2). Access shall be maintained on Gayhart Street (for MSF Site 3). Any roadway changes shall be designed according to applicable Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC), state, and local design criteria and standards where applicable, including fire code and Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria and standards, and shall provide adequate emergency access.	Project Measure	**No Adverse Effect** - Operational best management practices for the Build Alternative would be implemented for the MSF
Local Roadway Circulation	Potential local roadway circulation effects during operation of the Build Alternative	**NMM TRA-1 (Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard Intersection)**. At the Garfield Avenue and Washington Boulevard (Intersection #32), restripe the southbound lane approach by converting one through lane into a second left-turn lane and reconfiguring the right-turn lane as a shared through/right-turn lane to optimize this intersection's cycle length and splits.	Mitigation Measure	**No Adverse Effect** - Potential local roadway circulation effects during operation of the Build Alternative would be reduced

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV 2026, ***Appendix O****.*