

3-14 SOCIOECONOMICS

Changes Since the Draft EIS/EIR

Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIS/EIR in April 2004, the Gold Line Phase II project has undergone several updates:

Name Change: To avoid confusion expressed about the terminology used in the Draft EIS/EIR (e.g., Phase I; Phase II, Segments 1 and 2), the proposed project is referred to in the Final EIS/EIR as the Gold Line Foothill Extension.

Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative and Updated Project Definition: Following the release of the Draft EIS/EIR, the public comment period, and input from the cities along the alignment, the Construction Authority Board approved a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) in August 2004. This LPA included the Triple Track Alternative (2 LRT and 1 freight track) that was defined and evaluated in the Draft EIS/EIR, a station in each city, and the location of the Maintenance and Operations Facility. Segment 1 was changed to extend eastward to Azusa. A Project Definition Report (PDR) was prepared to define refined station and parking lot locations, grade crossings and two rail grade separations, and traction power substation locations. The Final EIS/EIR and engineering work that support the Final EIS/EIR are based on the project as identified in the Final PDR (March 2005), with the following modifications. Following the PDR, the Construction Authority Board approved a Revised LPA in June 2005. Between March and August 2005, station options in Arcadia and Claremont were added.

Changes in the Discussions: To make the Final EIS/EIR more reader-friendly, the following format and text changes have been made:

Discussion of a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative has been deleted since the LPA decision in August 2004 eliminated it as a potential preferred alternative.

Discussions of the LRT Alternatives have eliminated the breakout of the two track configurations used in the Draft EIS/EIR (Double Track and Triple Track). The Final EIS/EIR reports the impacts of a modified triple track configuration (2 LRT tracks and 1 freight track with two rail grade separations) but focuses on the phasing/geographic boundaries included in the LPA decisions.

Two LRT alternatives in the Final EIS/EIR are discussed under the general heading “Build Alternatives,” and are defined as:

1. Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative: This alternative would extend LRT service from the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station in Pasadena through the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont, terminating in Montclair. The cities from Pasadena to Azusa are also referred to in the Final EIS/EIR as Segment 1. The cities from Glendora to Montclair are also referred to in the Final EIS/EIR as Segment 2. Key changes from the Draft EIS/EIR are the inclusion of Azusa in Segment 1, the elimination of the Pacific Electric right-of-way option between Claremont and Montclair, the inclusion of a 24-acre Maintenance and Operations facility in Irwindale (the site is smaller than in the Draft EIS/EIR), and the addition of two rail grade separations. Note that the Maintenance and Operations Facility is located in Segment 1 but is part of the Full Build Alternative. In other words, it would not be constructed as an element of the Build LRT to Azusa Alternative (described below). The length of the alternative is approximately 24 miles. One station (and parking) would be located in each city, except for Azusa, which would have two. There are two options for the station locations in Arcadia and Claremont. Segment 1

- would include 2 LRT tracks throughout and 1 freight track between the Miller Brewing Company in Irwindale and the eastern boundary of Azusa. The freight track that now exists west of Miller Brewing, which serves a single customer in Monrovia, would be removed from service following relocation of that customer by the City of Monrovia. Segment 2 would include two LRT tracks throughout and 1 freight track between the eastern boundary of Azusa and Claremont. In Claremont, the single freight track joins up with the double Metrolink tracks (which are also used for freight movement) and continues through to Montclair (and beyond). This alternative also includes two railroad grade separations (in Azusa and in Pomona) so that LRT tracks would pass above the at-grade freight track. These allow the LRT and freight services to operate independently (thus eliminating the time-constrained double track option discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR). Implementation of the alternative would include relocation of the existing freight track within the rail right-of-way, but there would be no changes in the service provided to customers. The alternative includes 8 new traction power substations in Segment 2, as well as the 8 in Segment 1.
2. Build LRT to Azusa Alternative: This alternative (also referred to as Segment 1) would extend LRT service from the existing Sierra Madre Villa Station in Pasadena through the cities of Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, and to the eastern boundary of Azusa. (The main change from the Draft EIS/EIR is the inclusion of the City of Azusa.) The length of the alternative is approximately 11 miles. One station (and parking facility) would be located in each city, except for Azusa, which would have two. There are two options for the station location in Arcadia. Segment 1 would include two LRT tracks throughout and 1 freight track between the Miller Brewing Company in Irwindale and the eastern boundary of Azusa. The freight track that now exists west of Miller Brewing, which serves a single customer in Monrovia, would be removed from service following relocation of that customer by the City of Monrovia. This alternative also includes the railroad grade separation in Azusa so that LRT tracks would pass above the at-grade freight track. This allows the LRT and freight services to operate independently (thus eliminating the time-constrained double track option discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR). Implementation of the alternative would include relocation of the existing freight track within the rail right-of-way, but there would be no changes in the service provided to customers. The alternative also includes 8 new traction power substations.

As in the Draft EIS/EIR, impact forecasts use 2025 conditions, except for traffic impacts, which reflects a 2030 forecast based on the recently adopted 2004 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan.

Summary of Impacts

The No Build Alternative is expected to have negligible socioeconomic impacts within the cities of the study corridor.

During construction, socioeconomic impacts could occur to local business if access were restricted. Temporary access routings would be developed and implemented during the construction period.

Long-term socioeconomic impacts could arise in the vicinity of new LRT stations and the Maintenance and Operations Facility. Socioeconomic impacts around stations could arise from development or redevelopment driven by transit access. Development and redevelopment is controlled by local government. Long-term impacts may be identified by the planning and approval processes of these governments. Under CEQA, these impacts would typically be mitigated to less than significant levels through a combination of compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation measures developed by the cities.

Long-term socioeconomic impacts could also arise from the acquisition of properties for the LRT alternatives, or if those acquisitions were to result in the loss of employment. Implementation of the

proposed project would occur under the auspices of the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended (Uniform Act). The Uniform Act mandates that acquisitions be made at fair market value, and provides assistance for residential and business relocations caused by a federally sponsored project. State- and local-level projects are also implemented under programs that are consistent with the Uniform Act.

For the Maintenance and Operations Facility, long-term socioeconomic changes could occur in Irwindale and nearby communities to the extent that businesses that would serve that facility may choose to locate in those cities. If new or changed business activities were to occur, it can be assumed that the activities would have to comply with federal, state or local environmental regulations.

3-14.1 Existing Conditions

The study area for discussion of socioeconomics includes the 13 cities adjacent to the Gold Line ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Project, as those would be the cities served by the proposed project. From west to east, the cities are:

- Segment 1 Cities: Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and~~ Irwindale, ~~and~~ Azusa.
- Segment 2 Cities: ~~Azusa,~~ Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, Montclair, ~~and~~ Upland.

Table 3-14.1 shows population change in the study area from 1990–2025. Population calculations for 1990 and 2000 are based on U.S. Census data. Population forecasts are based on the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update.

TABLE 3-14.1 LOCAL AND REGIONAL POPULATION CHANGE					
City	1990 Population	2000 Population	Percent Change 1990– 2000	Forecasted Population 2025	Percent Change 2000 – 2025
Arcadia	48,290	53,054	+9.9	54,783	+3.1
Azusa	41,333	44,712	+8.2	51,595	+15.4
Claremont	32,503	33,998	+4.6	39,575	+16.4
Duarte	20,688	21,486	+3.9	27,101	+26.1
Glendora	47,828	49,415	+3.3	56,992	+15.3
Irwindale	1,050	1,446	+37.7	2,256	+56.0
La Verne	30,897	31,638	+2.4	37,411	+18.2
Montclair	28,434	33,049	+16.2	41,464	+25.5
Monrovia	35,761	36,929	+3.3	45,743	+23.9
Pasadena	131,591	133,936	+1.8	173,643	+29.6
Pomona	131,723	149,473	+13.5	189,687	+26.9
San Dimas	32,397	34,980	+8.0	40,488	+22.6
Upland	63,374	68,393	+7.9	88,166	+28.9
Study Area	645,869	692,509	+7.2	848,904	+22.6
LA County	8,863,164	9,519,338	+7.4	12,338,000	+29.6
SB County	1,418,380	1,709,434	+20.5	2,787,000	+63.0

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000 (SF1). Forecasts: 2001 SCAG RTP Update.

Table 3-14.2 provides information on employment in the study area for the period from 2000–2025. Employment forecasts are from the SCAG 2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update.

TABLE 3-14.2 CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT							
City	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	Percent Change 2000–2025
Arcadia	23,744	24,274	24,800	25,172	25,393	25,644	+8.0
Azusa	14,505	15,047	15,635	15,998	16,282	16,613	+14.5
Claremont	11,960	12,246	12,563	12,797	12,940	13,104	+9.5
Duarte	9,914	10,824	11,758	12,338	12,816	13,330	+34.4
Glendora	18,018	18,444	19,157	19,607	19,925	20,269	+12.5
Irwindale	32,550	37,886	43,322	46,550	49,432	51,512	+58.2
La Verne	8,996	9,504	10,130	10,523	10,835	11,172	+24.2
Montclair	17,357	19,649	22,296	23,833	25,198	26,653	+53.5
Monrovia	22,083	23,046	23,978	24,588	25,038	25,525	+15.6
Pasadena	93,287	96,502	99,749	101,977	103,578	105,366	+12.9
Pomona	50,609	52,726	54,948	56,404	57,453	58,644	+15.9
San Dimas	15,422	16,549	17,641	18,326	18,854	19,476	+26.3
Upland	28,313	32,398	37,080	39,821	42,263	44,875	+58.5
Study Area	346,758	369,096	393,057	407,934	420,007	432,183	+24.6
LA County	4,312,264	4,655,000	4,890,000	5,029,000	5,156,000	5,291,000	+22.7
SB County	735,589	715,000	852,000	933,000	1,007,000	1,086,000	+47.6

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000. Forecasts: 2001 SCAG RTP Update.

The study area contained more than 346,000 jobs in 2000. The employment forecasts from SCAG indicate that by 2025 an additional 85,425 jobs will be created within the area, a 24.6% increase from 2000. The largest employment centers are in Pasadena and Pomona. The cities of Duarte, Irwindale, San Dimas, and La Verne are forecasted to have employment growth greater than that of Los Angeles County. Employment growth for the cities of Montclair and Upland is forecasted to be greater than the rate for San Bernardino County. Between 2000 and 2025, approximately one job is forecasted to be created for every three new Los Angeles County residents. However, in the study area, approximately one job is forecasted to be created for every two new Los Angeles County study area residents. These employment data reflect that the proposed project area is currently an important regional employment corridor, and the forecasts indicate that the corridor’s importance as a regional employment will continue. An important feature of these employment numbers is that they reflect the presence of stable employment centers, such as colleges and hospitals.

The study area is ethnically diverse, as is typical of the Los Angeles metropolitan region. **Table 3-14.3** shows the reported ethnic breakdown of cities in the study area, where approximately 60% of the population is non-white. Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin represent the largest non-white segment of the study area at 269,307 persons, or about 39% of the total population. The highest percentages of non-whites were found in the cities of Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, and Pomona in Los Angeles County, and Montclair in San Bernardino County; all of the cities were predominately Hispanic or Latino.

Among the data gathered in the 2000 Census was information on how people made their journey to work, as shown in **Table 3-14.4**. These data indicate that approximately 88% of workers over the age of 16 living in the study area use a private vehicle to get to work, and approximately 4% used public transit. In Pasadena, before the opening of Gold Line Phase I in that city, 5% of workers used public transit. In Irwindale, 8% of workers used public transit. In Claremont, 3% of workers used public transit, 14% walked to work, and 5% worked at home. In all other cities in the Los Angeles County portion of the study area, a smaller percentage of workers took public transit to work than they did in Los Angeles County as a whole (7%). These numbers likely reflect that only bus services and limited amounts of commuter rail service were available in 2000 to residents of the Los Angeles County study area, as compared to other portions of Los Angeles County. In San Bernardino County, workers in Montclair and Upland used public transit at rates 50% higher than that county as a whole.

Table 3-14.5 reports income data for the study area. Approximately 14% of the population within the Gold Line ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Project area was below the poverty level, which is 4% lower than Los Angeles County. Azusa and Pomona are the only cities in the Los Angeles County portion of the study area that had a higher percentage of persons below the poverty line than Los Angeles County as a whole. Montclair showed a poverty level that was 1% higher than San Bernardino County as a whole. Per capita income in the study area averaged \$21,889, which was approximately \$1,200 a year higher than it is in Los Angeles County and about \$5,000 a year higher than San Bernardino County. The cities of Irwindale, Azusa, Pomona, and Montclair had markedly lower per capita incomes (less than 70% or \$14,000) compared to the study area.

**TABLE 3-14.3
EXISTING REGIONAL AND LOCAL POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS—RACE/ETHNICITY (2000)**

City	Total Population	White	%	Black	%	Native American	%	Asian	%	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	%	Other	%	Two or more races	%	Hispanic	%
Arcadia	52,951	21,365	40	434	1	122	0	23,959	45	62	0	184	0	1,585	3	5,240	10
Azusa	44,371	10,459	24	1,514	3	220	0	2,424	5	80	0	63	0	909	2	28,702	65
Claremont	33,978	21,831	64	1,603	5	60	0	3,913	12	27	0	94	0	1,127	3	5,323	16
Duarte	21,486	6,853	32	1,865	9	98	0	2,698	13	36	0	57	0	611	3	9,268	43
Glendora	49,719	33,380	67	664	1	190	0	3,212	6	25	0	73	0	1,158	2	11,017	22
Irwindale	1,472	119	8	0	0	6	0	15	1	6	0	0	0	25	2	1,301	88
La Verne	31,845	20,443	64	879	3	22	0	2,348	7	38	0	39	0	846	3	7,230	23
Montclair	33,119	7,914	24	2,056	6	46	0	2,601	8	97	0	0	0	493	1	19,912	60
Monrovia	36,817	17,017	46	2,984	8	196	1	2,480	7	32	0	69	0	1,062	3	12,977	35
Pasadena	133,871	51,998	39	18,672	14	340	0	13,261	10	101	0	249	0	4,446	3	44,804	33
Pomona	149,644	25,189	17	13,541	9	496	0	10,598	7	178	0	183	0	2,942	2	96,517	64
San Dimas	35,064	21,306	61	946	3	96	0	3,136	9	4	0	36	0	1,305	4	8,235	23
Upland	68,427	37,435	55	4,866	7	417	1	4,951	7	72	0	146	0	1,759	3	18,781	27
Study Area	692,764	275,309	40	50,024	7	2,309	0	75,596	11	758	0	1,193	0	18,268	3	269,307	39
LA County	9,519,338	2,946,145	31	891,194	9	26,141	0	1,123,964	12	24,376	0	18,859	0	245,172	3	4,243,487	45
SB County	1,709,434	749,224	44	147,488	9	10,249	1	77,205	5	4,601	0	2,999	0	46,766	3	669,902	39

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.
Percentages less than one are shown as zero.

**TABLE 3-14.4
EXISTING REGIONAL AND LOCAL POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS—MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK (2000)**

City	Total Workers	Car, truck, or van	%	Public Transit	%	Motor-cycle	%	Bicycle	%	Walked	%	Other means	%	Worked at home	%
Arcadia	22,935	21,089	92	556	2	76	0	21	0	293	1	54	0	846	4
Azusa	17,520	14,776	84	685	4	56	0	406	2	1,098	6	157	1	342	2
Claremont	15,805	12,189	77	453	3	40	0	152	1	2,156	14	41	0	774	5
Duarte	9,224	8,256	90	345	4	14	0	24	0	220	2	54	1	311	3
Glendora	23,362	21,677	93	448	2	59	0	65	0	317	1	80	0	716	3
Irwindale	571	475	83	47	8	0	0	10	2	38	7	0	0	1	0
La Verne	15,245	13,991	92	460	3	27	0	57	0	308	2	38	0	364	2
Montclair	12,252	11,108	91	359	3	32	0	80	1	292	2	146	1	235	2
Monrovia	16,477	14,714	89	474	3	35	0	143	1	557	3	96	1	458	3
Pasadena	61,891	51,861	84	2,897	5	71	0	878	1	3,280	5	532	1	2,372	4
Pomona	52,066	46,209	89	2,573	5	75	0	514	1	1,022	2	602	1	1,071	2
San Dimas	16,647	15,263	92	305	2	61	0	39	0	345	2	88	1	546	3
Upland	31,569	28,685	91	795	3	89	0	80	0	681	2	254	1	985	1
Study Area	295,564	260,293	88	10,397	4	635	0	2,469	1	10,607	4	2,142	1	9,021	3
LA County	3,858,750	3,296,964	85	254,091	7	6,758	0	24,015	1	113,004	3	29,275	1	134,643	3
SB County	658,708	600,169	91	12,267	2	1,467	0	2,715	0	15,867	2	5,187	1	20,676	3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

Percentages less than one are shown as zero.

Note: Percentages less than one are shown as zero

Area	Total Population	Below Poverty Level	Percent	Per Capita Income in 1999
Arcadia	52,403	4,150	8	\$28,400
Azusa	42,241	7,926	19	\$13,412
Claremont	29,032	2,328	8	\$28,843
Duarte	20,912	2,353	11	\$19,648
Glendora	48,710	2,856	6	\$25,993
Irwindale	1,467	240	16	\$13,144
La Verne	31,153	1,464	5	\$26,689
Montclair	32,688	5,690	17	\$13,566
Monrovia	36,600	4,797	13	\$21,686
Pasadena	131,350	20,909	16	\$28,186
Pomona	144,137	31,149	22	\$13,336
San Dimas	34,291	2,167	6	\$28,321
Upland	67,797	8,106	12	\$23,343
Study Area	627,781	94,135	14	\$21,889
LA County	9,349,771	1,674,599	18	\$20,683
SB County	1,662,617	263,412	16	\$16,856

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

Like the rest of Los Angeles County, housing vacancies in the study area were low (less than 4%). As shown in **Table 3-14.6**, vacancies were less than 2% in the cities of Duarte, Glendora, La Verne, and Claremont. Compared to San Bernardino County, which had a vacancy rate of 12%, the cities of Montclair and Upland had vacancy rates of 4% and 3%, respectively.

Homeownership in the Los Angeles portion of the study area was higher than it was in Los Angeles County as a whole, with the exception of Pasadena, where the homeownership rate was 2% lower. In Montclair and Upland, the homeownership rate was similar to the overall San Bernardino County rate (57%). The average household size in the study area (2.93 persons per household) was nearly the same as it was in Los Angeles County (2.98 persons per household), but less than in San Bernardino County (3.19 persons per household). The household size in Montclair (3.70) was higher than in San Bernardino County.

TABLE 3-14.6 LOCAL AND REGIONAL HOUSING OCCUPANCY, TENURE, AND SIZE										
City	Total	Vacant	%	Occupied	%	Owner Occupied	%	Renter Occupied	%	Average Household
Arcadia	19,981	847	4	19,134	96	11,921	62	7,213	38	2.74
Azusa	12,919	480	4	12,439	96	6,264	50	6,175	50	3.41
Claremont	11,577	273	2	11,304	98	7,570	67	3,734	33	2.55
Duarte	6,805	170	2	6,635	98	4,710	71	1,925	29	3.16
Glendora	17,169	312	2	16,857	98	12,385	73	4,472	27	2.89
Irwindale	417	13	3	404	97	277	69	127	31	3.64
La Verne	11,288	218	2	11,070	98	8,643	78	2,427	22	2.81
Montclair	9,179	380	4	8,799	96	5,320	58	3,479	38	3.70
Monrovia	13,929	448	3	13,481	97	6,471	48	7,010	52	2.71
Pasadena	54,114	2,287	4	51,827	96	23,670	46	28,157	54	2.51
Pomona	39,620	1,730	4	37,890	96	21,684	57	16,206	43	3.82
San Dimas	12,585	352	3	12,233	97	8,998	74	3,235	26	2.77
Upland	25,469	912	3	24,557	96	14,470	57	10,087	40	2.76
Study Area	235,952	8,422	3	226,630	96	133,283	58	94,247	42	2.93
LA County	3,270,909	137,135	4	3,133,774	96	1,499,694	48	1,634,080	52	2.98
SB County	601,369	72,775	12	528,594	87	341,014	57	187,580	31	3.15

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

3-14.2 Environmental Impacts

3-14.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

Impact criteria were established through consideration of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines and standard professional practice. The proposed project was then evaluated using the impact criteria to determine what the level of impact on population, housing, and employment conditions, if any, would result.

3-14.2.2 Impact Criteria

a. NEPA Impact Criteria

There are no FTA-specific criteria for determining adverse impacts for socioeconomic impacts. Executive Order 12898 focuses on disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations, not whether there is an impact. The CEQA criteria utilized for assessing impacts and whether those impacts are significant provide a more comprehensive approach, and also include evaluation of the disproportionately high impacts to minority or low income populations.

b. CEQA Impact Criteria

The proposed project would result in a significant impact under CEQA if:

- The proposed project would displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing; or
- The proposed project would displace substantial numbers of existing businesses or employees, necessitating the construction of replacement businesses; or
- The proposed project would substantially impair access to, from, or within a neighborhood, or create a barrier within a neighborhood; or
- The proposed project would induce substantial unplanned population growth, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); or
- The proposed project would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income population groups.

3-14.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative includes the extension of Interstate 210 (I-210) from Interstate 15 (I-15) to Interstate 215 (I-215); implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT; completion and service on the Eastside LRT Extension; and countywide bus service improvements, including in the San Gabriel Valley. Construction period impacts would be greatest for the I-210 extension and Eastside LRT Extension due to the scope and magnitude of construction activities. The I-210 extension would be about 10 miles long, and is more than 5 miles east of the ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension study area. The Eastside LRT Extension is approximately 6 miles long and connects to the south end of the Phase I LRT service. Construction needed to implement increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line would be limited to areas where traction power substations would be added. Construction impacts to implement increases in countywide bus service are likely to be limited to modifications or additional bus stops.

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Phase I are Los Angeles, South Pasadena, and Pasadena. The projects in the No Build Alternative that could affect these cities are completion and service on the Eastside LRT Extension, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, and countywide bus service improvements.

Construction impacts would occur in the City of Los Angeles from construction of the Eastside LRT Extension. The construction impacts and mitigation measures of this project are described in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FTA and LACMTA 2001). Increasing service on Phase I of the Gold Line would not require any property acquisitions that could potentially affect socio-economics. More service could mean a potential increase in persons boarding and alighting at Phase I stations; however, these patrons would likely be composed mostly of persons who live or work in these areas now. Accordingly, there is little likelihood of a substantive change in the socioeconomic makeup in Phase I cities. See Table 3-15.26 for the changes in ridership in Phase I cities in 2025, which include the assumption that the Full Build ~~Phase II~~ (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative of the Foothill Extension and Eastside LRT projects are in place. This maximum ridership scenario indicates that ridership would increase by over 1,000 persons at Union Station, but only between 30 and 80 persons at the other Phase I stations in Los Angeles. The maximum ridership scenario shows an increase of less than 50 persons in South Pasadena; and increases of between about 30 and 250 at Pasadena stations. There is a forecasted decrease of about 250 boardings at Sierra Madre Villa station, reflecting that it would no longer be the terminal station and patrons who now use that location would be boarding further east in the system.

The portion of countywide bus improvements that may occur within the Phase I cities (Los Angeles, South Pasadena, and Pasadena) during the construction period for the proposed project is not expected to include substantial amounts of construction in the Phase I cities. The planned service improvements would be likely to include upgraded or additional bus stops. No property acquisitions are anticipated. Due to the very limited areas of construction of such facilities, effects would be expected to be less than adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA. For example, creating new bus stops would typically involve construction for less than 2 weeks at each site. Increases in bus service could have some beneficial effects to neighborhoods by increasing transit accessibility to and among housing, commercial activities, and jobs for area residents. However, the amount of improved access is not likely to be of sufficient magnitude to induce substantial changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The limited amount of construction and the minimal effect of increased transit service associated with countywide bus improvements would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of Phase I cities.

Foothill_Extension, Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Foothill Extension Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and Irwindale, and Azusa~~. The projects in the No Build Alternative affecting these cities during the ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension construction period are implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT and countywide bus service improvements.

Completion of the Eastside Extension and increased Gold Line Phase I service have the potential to increase ridership to and from LRT stations in Pasadena during the construction of ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension. As reported above, the maximum ridership scenario shows a drop in boardings at Sierra Madre Villa station, reflecting that it would no longer be the terminal station and patrons who now use that location would be boarding farther east in the system.

The portion of countywide bus improvements that may occur within the ~~Phase II~~ Segment 1 cities is not expected to include substantial amounts of construction. The planned service improvements would be likely to include upgraded or additional bus stops. No property acquisitions are anticipated. Due to the very limited areas of construction of such facilities, effects to socioeconomic characteristics would be expected to be less than adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA. For example, creating new bus stops would typically involve construction for less than 2 weeks at each site, which should not substantively affect the operation of local businesses. Increases in bus service could have

some beneficial effects to neighborhoods by increasing transit accessibility to and among housing, commercial activities, and jobs for area residents. However, the amount of improved access is not likely to be of sufficient magnitude to induce substantial changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The limited amount of construction and the minimal effect of increased transit service associated with countywide bus improvements would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 cities.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 are ~~Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, Montclair, and Upland~~. The project in the No Build Alternative affecting the cities during the construction period of the proposed project is the Los Angeles County bus service improvements. Even though Montclair and Upland are in San Bernardino County, they are affected by changes in Los Angeles County bus service because that service is linked to the Montclair TransCenter. The Eastside Extension and increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT would not have an effect on Segment 2 cities because there would be no stations in these cities. As noted earlier, the proposed extension of I-210 eastward is more than 5 miles east of the eastern end of the proposed project study area. Due to this distance, no effects from the freeway extension are expected within the study area.

The potential impact of increased bus service to the ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 cities during the construction period is the same as for the ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 cities. The limited amount of construction and the minimal effect of increased transit service associated with countywide bus improvements would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 cities.

b. Build Alternatives

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Phase I are Los Angeles, South Pasadena, and Pasadena. There are no physical elements of the Foothill Extension that affect these cities.

There would be increases in ridership in the Phase I cities arising from extending LRT service into the proposed project corridor, and thus improving accessibility to jobs. Initial ridership estimates for the full LRT system (i.e., Eastside Extension, Phase I, and ~~Phase II Foothill Extension~~ [including operating scenarios for either Segment 1 only or Segments 1 and 2]) indicate that daily boardings in 2025 would be as shown in Table 3-15.26 in the Traffic and Transportation Section. This maximum ridership scenario indicates that ridership would increase by over 1,000 persons at Union Station, but only between 30 and 80 persons at the other Phase I stations in Los Angeles. The maximum ridership scenario shows an increase of less than 50 persons in South Pasadena; and increases of between about 30 and 250 at Pasadena stations. There is a forecasted decrease of about 250 boardings at Sierra Madre Villa station, reflecting that it would no longer be the terminal station and patrons who now use that location would be boarding further east in the system.

The effect of the small changes in boardings associated with the Build Alternatives ~~for either operating scenario (Segment 1 or Segments 1 and 2)~~ would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the overall socioeconomic makeup of Phase I cities during the construction period. The change in boarding would not be of sufficient magnitude to induce substantial changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The minimal effect of change in transit service associated

with the Build Alternatives would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of Phase I cities during the construction period.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and Irwindale~~, and Azusa.

The 2025 ridership forecast for the LRT stations in Segment 1 indicate the following daily boardings for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative (Segments 1 and 2):

- Arcadia would have daily boardings of about ~~1,850~~ 1,750;
- Monrovia would have daily boardings of about ~~1,580~~ 1,500;
- Duarte would have daily boardings of about ~~1,300~~ 1,230;
- Irwindale would have daily boardings of about ~~2,165~~ 1,970;
- Azusa stations would have daily boardings of about 2,560.

Since these Segment 1 stations would be built before those in Segment 2, a portion of these forecasted boardings could become a reality during construction in Segment 2. The 2010 boardings could influence socioeconomic conditions on a localized basis, but are not anticipated to be sufficient to induce major changes in socioeconomic conditions. As discussed in detail in the Land Use section individual cities have and will consider land use changes near the proposed LRT stations that respond to availability of LRT and bus transit. The level of forecasted boardings could result in some shifting of the specific locations of housing or commercial activities, but is not likely to be of significant magnitude to induce major changes in socioeconomic characteristics of the cities. Substantive changes in socioeconomic characteristics are driven by overall market conditions in the cities and the region, and large-scale land use changes, such as conversion of agricultural lands to residential or commercial uses. There are no large-scale conversions proposed in the Segment 1 cities that are related to the proposed LRT stations or services.

The effect of boardings associated with the Build Alternatives would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 cities. The limited effect of new transit service associated with the LRT Triple Track Configuration would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 cities.

Construction activities to implement the Build Alternatives would include rehabilitation of the existing railroad right-of-way, laying of new tracks, installation of an overhead power system and signal equipment, and building new station platforms and parking facilities. Depending on how the proposed project is implemented, construction activities would occur over time as a series of overlapping actions. The duration or frequency of construction at a particular location cannot be predicted at this time. However, based on experience from construction of LRT systems in California, and from construction of Phase I, there are no indicators that the construction process results in substantial changes to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of a community.

There is the potential for temporary and localized impacts to occur during the construction process that might affect residents or businesses. These temporary impacts are usually associated with access restrictions to property. These can be in the form of temporary loss of parking for customers and access to delivery docks or closures of walkways. Under NEPA, construction period impacts are typically

considered to be temporary and not adverse. Under CEQA, construction period impacts can be considered to be significant and to require mitigation. The current level of design provides ~~Since this environmental document is being prepared based only on conceptual level design, there is~~ insufficient data to formally determine if construction period impacts would be significant under CEQA. Using a conservative approach, it is assumed that construction period impacts may be significant under CEQA and mitigation measures would be needed to reduce construction period impacts to less-than-significant levels. A menu of ~~potential~~ mitigation measures for the construction period is shown in Section 3-14.3.1.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Segment 2 are ~~Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair, and Upland.~~ Under the operating scenario that limits LRT service to Segment 1 only, the impacts to Segment 2 cities would be the same as described for ~~either~~ the No Build Alternative. The minimal effect of increased transit service associated with ~~either~~ the No Build Alternative would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of the ~~Phase II, Segment 2~~ cities during the construction phase.

The overall impacts for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative (Segments 1 and 2) would be the same for Segment 2 cities as was described for the Segment 1 cities. LRT boardings would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II, Segment 2~~ cities. Socioeconomic conditions in Upland are poised to change as a result of new developments at the west end of that city that will add hundreds of new residences, as well as commercial development.

The forecasted boardings for the Segment 2 cities in 2025 are presented below. ~~It should be noted that boardings would vary depending on which of the potential station sites in La Verne and Pomona are considered.~~

- ~~• About 1,100 boardings are forecasted for the proposed downtown Azusa station.~~
- ~~• The proposed Citrus Avenue station in Azusa would have daily boardings of about 750 persons.~~
- ~~• The proposed Glendora station would have daily boardings of about 1,200 persons.~~
- ~~• About 1,000 daily boardings would occur in San Dimas.~~
- ~~• Depending on which station site is selected~~ In La Verne, daily boardings are forecasted to be about ~~between 900 and 1,000~~ persons.
- ~~• Also depending on which station site is selected~~ In Pomona, daily boardings are forecasted to be ~~between about 1,100, 1,400 and 1,400~~ persons.
- ~~• In Claremont, daily LRT boardings are forecasted to be between 1,940 and about 2,000 persons.~~
- ~~• For the joint Montclair/Upland station, the forecasted daily boardings are about 2,300 persons.~~

During the Segment 2 construction period, boardings would begin to occur from west to east as stations are completed and linked to the LRT system. A portion of the 2025 boardings would begin to occur, which could have very localized effects on socioeconomic conditions. Overall, however, the limited effect of new transit service associated with the Build Alternatives in the 2010 period would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of ~~Phase II~~ Segment 2 cities.

As discussed for Segment 1 cities, localized and temporary socioeconomic impacts may occur during the construction period that may be significant under CEQA. The current level of design provides ~~Since this environmental document is being prepared based only on conceptual level design, there is~~ insufficient

data to formally determine if construction period impacts would be significant under CEQA. Using a conservative approach, it is assumed that construction period impacts may be significant under CEQA and mitigation measures would be needed to reduce construction period impacts to less-than-significant levels. A menu of ~~potential~~ mitigation measures for the construction period is shown in Section 3-14.3.1.

Summary of Impacts for Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative

For the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative (operations in Segments 1 and 2), there would be no adverse effects under NEPA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of cities in Phase I, in ~~Phase II~~, Foothill Extension Segment 1, or in ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension Segment 2 during the construction period.

Under CEQA, there would not be significant impacts to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of cities in Phase I, in ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension Segment 1, or in ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension Segment 2, but localized, potentially significant impacts may occur during the construction period.

Summary of Impacts for Build LRT to Azusa Alternative

For the LRT Triple Track physical configuration of the ~~Build LRT Alternative to Maintenance Facility~~ Build LRT to Azusa Alternative (operations in Segment 1 only), there would be no adverse effects under NEPA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of cities in Phase I or ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension Segment 1 during the construction period.

Under CEQA, there would not be significant impacts to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of cities in Phase I or in ~~Phase II~~ the Foothill Extension Segment 1, but localized, potentially significant impacts may occur during the construction period.

3-14.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative includes extension of I-210 from I-15 to I-215, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, completion and service on the Eastside LRT Extension, and countywide bus service improvements, including the San Gabriel Valley. Potential long-term impacts would arise from new or increased transportation service provided by these projects.

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Phase I are Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena. The projects in the No Build Alternative that could affect these cities in the long-term are completion and service on the Eastside LRT Extension, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, and countywide bus service improvements.

The city of Los Angeles would likely see long-term benefits as a result of development of the Eastside LRT Extension. Among the benefits would be improved transit accessibility and reliability of service, improved access to jobs, as well as the community and economic benefits associated with LRT service. These benefits are discussed in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FTA and LACMTA, 2001) for the Eastside Extension project.

This document concluded that after mitigation measures were factored in, the only long-term, potentially significant impacts under CEQA were to traffic at 14 intersections.

Increasing LRT service on Phase I of the Gold Line would increase access to jobs in each of the Phase I cities that are located in proximity to, or convenient access to, this transit service. Forecasts of employment growth in each of the cities by SCAG in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (2001 RTP or Community Link 2001) recognize and reflect the effects of LRT service at the proposed increased service levels. These forecasts have been concurred by each of the cities for planning purposes. These planning forecasts are considered in each city in their individual analyses of proposed development or redevelopment projects, and in potential planning and zoning designations. SCAG's RTP 2001 Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) stated that it was "not anticipated that changes to the transportation network included in the 2001 RTP Update will substantially change population, employment and household rates of growth or distribution of growth." The PEIR reported that the impact of the RTP would be less than significant with regard to overall socioeconomic conditions and that no mitigation measures would be required. A review of socioeconomic conditions in the Phase I cities that could logically be associated with the introduction of LRT service indicate that transit-oriented development (TOD) has begun near some Phase I stations. Examples are new residential and mixed use developments in South Pasadena and Pasadena. Increasing LRT service would be likely to support and continue TOD activities, resulting in possible shifts in the locations of employment and residential development.

That portion of countywide bus improvements which may occur within the Phase I cities (Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena) between now and 2025 could have some beneficial effects to neighborhoods by increasing transit accessibility to and among housing, commercial activities, and jobs for area residents. However, the amount of improved access is not likely to be of sufficient magnitude to induce long-term changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The limited effect of increased transit service associated with countywide bus improvements would result in no long-term adverse effects under NEPA and no long-term significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of Phase I cities from this element of the No Build Alternative.

None of the elements of the No Build Alternative would create adverse effects under NEPA nor significant impacts under CEQA to long-term socioeconomic conditions in the Phase I cities because of the following: (1) the forecasted socioeconomic conditions associated with increasing LRT service in Phase I have been concurred in by the individual cities; (2) those forecasts have been assimilated into the cities' planning processes; (3) a program-level CEQA analysis of potential impacts has already been completed that identified no significant impacts; (4) TOD activities have begun to occur that appear consistent with SCAG's socioeconomic growth forecasts; (5) each cities' development approval authority is designed to identify and eliminate or reduce potential negative impacts associated with specific projects; and (6) the limited amount of construction associated with the No Build Alternative and the incremental increase in transit service would not be of sufficient magnitude to induce substantial change.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and Irwindale~~, and Azusa. The projects in the No Build Alternative that could affect these cities in the long-term are completion and service on the Eastside LRT Extension, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, and countywide bus service improvements.

There would be increases in ridership in the Phase I cities arising from extending LRT service into East Los Angeles and increases in Phase I service. However, when the data in Table 3-15.26 is considered, it

is clear that there would be only small changes in boardings at the Segment 1 stations. The change in boarding would not be of sufficient magnitude to induce substantial changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The minimal effect of change in service associated with the No Build Alternative would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Segment 1 cities.

The potential long-term impact of increased bus service to the ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 cities would result from new or improved transit service. As noted for the Phase I cities, countywide bus improvements could have some beneficial effects to neighborhoods by increasing transit accessibility to and among housing, commercial activities, and jobs for area residents. However, the amount of improved access is not likely to be of sufficient magnitude to induce long-term changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The limited effect of increased bus service associated with countywide bus improvements would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Segment 1 cities from this element of the No Build Alternative.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 are ~~Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair, and Upland~~. The project in the No Build Alternative affecting the cities in the long-term is the Los Angeles county bus service improvements. Although Montclair and Upland are in San Bernardino County, they are affected by changes in Los Angeles County bus service because that service is linked to the Montclair TransCenter. The Eastside LRT extension and increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT would not have an effect on these cities because there would be no stations in these cities. As noted earlier, the proposed extension of I-210 eastward is more than 5 miles east of the eastern end of the ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension study area. Due to this distance, no effects from the freeway extension are expected within the study corridor.

The impact of bus service improvements would be the same in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 cities as described for the Segment 1 cities. The limited effect of increased bus service associated with countywide bus improvements would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II~~ Segment 2 cities from this element of the No Build Alternative.

Socioeconomic conditions in Azusa and Glendora are poised to change as a result of redevelopment of the Monrovia Nursery properties. Socioeconomic conditions in Upland are poised to change as a result of new developments at the west end of that city which will add hundreds of new residences, as well as commercial development.

b. Build Alternatives

Long-term impacts could arise from the introduction of LRT service to the ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension study corridor and the creation of ~~11~~ 12 new LRT stations and a maintenance and operations facility. Potential impacts would generally be focused around new stations to the extent that new facilities (stations and parking) are created, or that land uses and activities change as a result of being located in proximity to the stations.

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Phase I are Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena. There are no physical elements of the LRT Triple Track configuration that affect these cities.

There would be increases in ridership in the Phase I cities arising from extending LRT service into the ~~Phase II Foothill Extension~~ corridor, and thus improving accessibility to jobs. See Table 3-15.26 for the changes in ridership in Phase I cities in 2025, which include the assumption that the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative and Eastside LRT projects are in place. This maximum ridership scenario indicates that ridership would increase by over 1,000 persons at Union Station, but only between 30 and 80 persons at the other Phase I stations in Los Angeles. The maximum ridership scenario shows an increase of less than 50 persons in South Pasadena; and increases of between about 30 and 250 at Pasadena stations. There is a forecasted decrease of about 250 boardings at Sierra Madre Villa station, reflecting that it would no longer be the terminal station and patrons who now use that location would be boarding further east in the system.

The effect of these small changes in boardings associated with the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the overall socioeconomic makeup of Phase I cities. The change in boarding would not be of sufficient magnitude to induce substantial changes in housing, employment, or the location and economic viability of commercial activities. The minimal effect of change in service associated with the Build Alternatives would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the long-term overall socioeconomic characteristics of Phase I cities.

Foothill Extension Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in ~~Phase II~~ Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte ~~and Irwindale~~, and Azusa.

The 2025 ridership forecast for the LRT stations in Segment 1 indicates the following daily boardings. These forecasted numbers are shown in Table 3-15.18 and 3-15.19 and are summarized below.

- Arcadia would have daily boardings of about ~~1,850~~ 1,750;
- Monrovia would have daily boardings of about ~~1,580~~ 1,500;
- Duarte would have daily boardings of about ~~1,300~~ 1,230;
- Irwindale would have daily boardings of about ~~2,165~~ 1,970;
- Azusa stations would have daily boardings of about 2,560.

The boardings at these stations could influence socioeconomic conditions on a localized basis. As discussed in detail in the Land Use section, individual cities have and will consider land use changes in the vicinity of the proposed LRT stations that respond to availability of LRT and bus transit. The level of forecasted boardings could result in some shifting of the specific locations of housing or commercial activities, but is not likely to be of significant magnitude to induce major changes in socioeconomic characteristics of the cities. Substantive changes in socioeconomic characteristics are driven by overall market conditions in the cities and the region, and large-scale land use changes, such as conversion of agricultural lands to residential or commercial uses. There are no large-scale conversions proposed in the Segment 1 cities that are related to the proposed LRT stations or services.

Cities in the corridor have initiated planning to respond to and accommodate potential land use changes in the vicinity of proposed LRT stations. Specific information on these plans is discussed in the Land Use

section. The introduction of LRT stations may influence how specific sites near the stations are developed or redeveloped. The introduction of LRT service is likely to be of importance on a local basis, and could be a driving force in planning, rezoning, and development and redevelopment. However, these changes are not anticipated to be of sufficient magnitude to have an effect on the overall socioeconomic characteristics of the individual communities or of the study corridor. The limited effect of new transit service associated with the Build Alternatives would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of ~~Phase II~~ Segment 1 cities.

Under NEPA and CEQA, long-term beneficial impacts would appear likely to result from the Build Alternatives to the extent that the alternative reinforces the economic vitality of individual communities and serves as a catalyst for types of development or redevelopment envisioned and/or enabled by local plans.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The forecasted boardings for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative (operation in Segments 1 + and 2) for 2025 are presented below. ~~It should be noted that boardings would vary depending on which of the potential station sites in La Verne and Pomona are considered.~~

- ~~• About 1,100 boardings are forecasted for the proposed downtown Azusa station.~~
- ~~• The proposed Citrus Avenue station in Azusa would have daily boardings of about 750 persons.~~
- The proposed Glendora station would have daily boardings of about 1,200 persons.
- About 1,000 daily boardings would occur in San Dimas.
- ~~• Depending on which station site is selected~~ In La Verne, daily boardings are forecasted to be about ~~between 900 and~~ 1,000 persons.
- ~~• Also depending on which station site is selected~~ In Pomona, daily boardings are forecasted to be ~~between about 1,100~~ 1,400 ~~and 1,400~~ persons.
- In Claremont, daily LRT boardings are forecasted to be ~~a between 1,940 and~~ about 2,000 persons.
- For the ~~joint~~ Montclair/Upland station, the forecasted daily boardings are about 2,300 persons.

The overall impacts of the LRT Triple Track Alternative for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative operating scenario (Segment 1+ and 2) would be the same for Segment 2 cities as was described for the Segment 1 cities. LRT boardings would not be of sufficient magnitude to change the long-term overall socioeconomic makeup of ~~Phase II~~ Segment 2 cities. Socioeconomic conditions in ~~Azusa and~~ Glendora are poised to change as a result of redevelopment of the Monrovia Nursery properties. Socioeconomic conditions in Upland are poised to change as a result of new developments at the west end of that city which will add hundreds of new residences, as well as commercial development.

Summary of Impacts for Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative

The long-term overall impacts for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative operating scenario (Segments 1 and 2) would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of Phase I, ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Segment 1, or ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Segment 2 cities.

Summary of Impacts for Build LRT to Azusa Alternative

The long-term overall impacts of the LRT Triple Track Alternative for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative operating scenario (Segments 1 and 2) would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to the overall socioeconomic characteristics of Phase I or ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension Segment 1 cities.

3-14.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

a. No Build Alternative

Cumulative impacts could potentially occur from implementation of the No Build Alternative, which includes extension of I-210 in San Bernardino County, construction and service on the Eastside LRT Extension, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, and countywide bus service improvements. Of these projects, extension of I-210 in San Bernardino County, construction and service on the Eastside LRT Extension have the greatest potential to contribute to cumulative socioeconomic impacts by providing improved transportation service. In the case of extending I-210, additional freeway access would likely support new or additional residential and commercial development. The approval of such residential and commercial development is under the authority of San Bernardino County and individual cities. The Eastside LRT Extension is likely to support redevelopment around stations, which could alter the socioeconomic characteristics of neighborhoods to some degree. Changes around these future LRT stations would be under the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles.

The projects included in the No Build Alternative are spread across cities in Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties, and would be implemented in a series of construction contracts over the coming decade. Since the projects are so widespread, cumulative impacts, either from construction or operation of the No Build Alternative projects would not be likely to occur to a particular city or neighborhood. Other projects that may occur during the No Build construction period are listed in Appendix G, Related Projects. These projects range from redevelopment of individual parcels to redevelopment of the Monrovia Nursery properties in ~~Azusa and Glendora~~. Large-scale projects have a higher potential to contribute to cumulative socioeconomic impacts. A review of the related projects (many of which are defined only at the conceptual level) does not reveal a combination of such projects with No Build projects that appear likely to create substantial cumulative impacts.

b. Build Alternatives

The total potential for cumulative impacts would be greater for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative (Segments 1 and 2) than the ~~Build Alternative to Maintenance Facility~~ Build LRT to Azusa Alternative (Segment 1 only) because of the additional stations in Segment 2.

Cumulative impacts would be mostly likely to arise from the combination of additional transit ridership and redevelopment around stations, which could include changes in land use. Potential cumulative impacts associated with changes in land use are discussed in Section 3-10. In general, land use changes in station areas associated with LRT service have already been accounted for by individual cities' planning efforts. This planning typically calls for increased residential densities or commercial activity within walking distances of stations. These increases in density or activity would be consistent with the overall socioeconomic profile of the individual cities; no substantive changes would occur as the result of LRT service. The City of Upland has the greatest amount of forecasted change in its socioeconomic profile,

arising from planned development to the north and east of the proposed Montclair/Upland LRT stations. These changes arise from current planning and approval activities that recognize, but are not dependent on, proposed LRT service.

3-14.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

a. Construction Period Impacts

There are no specific regulations related to socioeconomic impacts during construction. There are typically policies associated with assuring access to residential and commercial properties so that such properties remain viable. For all alternatives, it is assumed that temporary access routings for pedestrians and vehicles would be provided as needed. Overall, ensuring that temporary access routings are provided for pedestrians and vehicles can be assumed to be a regulatory requirement, and would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to socioeconomic characteristics.

Summary of Impacts for No Build Alternative Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

Ensuring that temporary access routings are provided for pedestrians and vehicles is the only regulatory requirement associated with socioeconomic issues under the No Build Alternative, and would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to socioeconomic characteristics.

b. Build Alternatives

Potential socioeconomic impacts during the construction period are related to restrictions on access to residential or business properties if such restriction would affect the viability of these properties.

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

There are no Build Alternative elements in any of the cities in Phase I and thus no regulatory compliance applies. The portion of the alignment in Pasadena would be served by double tracking since there is no need for triple tracks west of ~~Duarte~~ Irwindale. Accordingly there is no need for regulatory compliance in these cities.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 - The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in ~~Phase II~~ Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and~~ Irwindale, and Azusa. LRT stations in Segment 1 would include the existing station at Sierra Madre Villa in Pasadena, and new stations in Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and~~ Irwindale, and Azusa. Construction period impacts affecting access to properties, which has the potential to affect socioeconomic characteristics, are most likely to occur in the vicinity of the new stations. As previously stated, ensuring that temporary access routings are provided for pedestrians and vehicles is the only regulatory requirement associated with socioeconomic issues for the construction period.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 are ~~Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair, and Upland~~. New stations would be built in each city ~~except for a joint Montclair/Upland station~~. Construction period impacts affecting access to properties, which has the potential to affect socioeconomic characteristics, are most likely to occur in the vicinity of the new stations. As previously stated, ensuring that temporary access routings are provided for pedestrians and vehicles is the only regulatory requirement associated with socioeconomic issues for the construction period.

Summary of Construction Period Impacts for Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

Ensuring that temporary access routings are provided for pedestrians and vehicles is the only regulatory requirement associated with socioeconomic issues for the construction period for the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative. Meeting this requirement would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to socioeconomic characteristics.

Summary of Construction Period Impacts for Build LRT to Azusa Alternative Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

Ensuring that temporary access routings are provided for pedestrians and vehicles is the only regulatory requirement associated with socioeconomic issues for the construction period for the ~~Build LRT Alternative to Maintenance Facility~~ Build LRT to Azusa Alternative. Meeting this requirement would result in no adverse effects under NEPA and no significant impacts under CEQA to socioeconomic characteristics.

3-14.2.7 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts associated with the alternatives were identified in Section 3-14.1.2.4, above. Elimination or reduction of these long-term impacts would occur through two steps, as follows: (1) compliance with local, state or federal regulations or permits that have been developed by agencies to manage construction impacts, to meet legally established environmental impact criteria or thresholds, and/or to ensure that actions occurring under agency approvals or permits are in compliance with laws and policies, and (2) implementation of the proposed alternatives with additional mitigation measures defined in Section 31-4.1.3.2. Following is a discussion of the long-term impacts for each of the alternatives that would be addressed by the first step, regulatory compliance.

Long-term socioeconomic impacts could arise in the vicinity of new LRT stations and the Maintenance and Operations Facility. Socioeconomic impacts around stations could arise from development or redevelopment driven by transit access. As described in the Land Use section (Section 3-10), development and redevelopment ~~is~~ are controlled by local government. Long-term impacts may be identified by the planning and approval processes of these governments. Under CEQA, these impacts would typically be mitigated to less than significant levels through a combination of compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

Long-term socioeconomic impacts could also arise from the acquisition of properties for the proposed project, or if those acquisitions were to result in the loss of employment. As described in the Acquisitions and Displacements section (Section 3-1), implementation of the proposed project would occur under the

auspices of the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended (Uniform Act). The Uniform Act mandates that acquisitions be made at fair market value, and provides assistance for residential and business relocations caused by a federally-sponsored project. State- and local-level projects are also implemented under programs that are consistent with the Uniform Act.

For the Maintenance and Operations Facility, long-term socioeconomic changes could occur in Irwindale and nearby communities to the extent that businesses that would serve that facility may choose to locate in those cities. If new or changed business activities were to occur, it can be assumed that the activities would have to comply with federal, state or local environmental regulations.

a. No Build Alternative

Any property acquisitions and relocations that would occur as part of a No Build Alternative project would occur under the auspices of the Uniform Act or similar policy.

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in Phase I are Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena. The projects in the No Build Alternative that could affect these cities are completion and service on the Eastside LRT Extension, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, and countywide bus service improvements.

Property acquisitions and relocations would occur in Los Angeles as part of the Eastside LRT Extension. Long-term impacts (loss of properties and relocations) are discussed in the environmental document for that project. Any property acquisitions and relocations that would occur as part that project would occur under the auspices of the Uniform Act or similar policy.

Increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT is likely to include property acquisition for additional TPSS. LACMTA has initiated an environmental document that will identify property needs and any necessary relocations. Any property acquisitions and relocations that would be needed would occur under the auspices of the LACMTA policy.

No property acquisitions or relocations would occur in South Pasadena or Pasadena for the No Build Alternative.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and Irwindale, and Azusa.~~ The projects in the No Build Alternative affecting these cities during the ~~Phase II Foothill Extension~~ construction period are implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT and countywide bus service improvements. No property acquisitions or relocations are necessary in any of these cities for the No Build Alternative.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 are ~~Azusa~~, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, Montclair, and Upland. The project in the No Build Alternative affecting the cities during the construction period of the proposed ~~Phase II Foothill Extension~~ is the Los Angeles county bus service improvements. Even though Montclair and Upland are in San Bernardino County, they are affected by changes in Los Angeles County bus service because that service is linked to the Montclair TransCenter. No property acquisitions or relocations are necessary in any of these cities for the No Build Alternative.

Summary of Long-term Impacts for No Build Alternative Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

The long-term socioeconomic impacts for the No Build Alternative that could arise from property acquisitions and relocations would be reduced or eliminated by compliance with the Uniform Act or similar policy.

b. Build Alternatives

Long-term socioeconomic impacts associated with LRT could arise in the vicinity of new LRT stations and the Maintenance and Operations Facility. Socioeconomic impacts around stations could arise from development or redevelopment driven by transit access. As described in the Land Use section (Section 3-10), development and redevelopment is controlled by local government. Long-term impacts may be identified by the planning and approval processes of these governments. Under CEQA, these impacts would typically be mitigated to less than significant levels through a combination of compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation measures.

Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

Phase I includes Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena. There are no elements of the Triple Track configuration in these cities. Under the Build Alternatives, the portion within Pasadena would be served by double tracks since there is no need for three tracks west of ~~Monrovia~~ Irwindale. Since there are no elements in these cities, regulatory compliance is not applicable.

Foothill Extension, Segment 1 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, ~~and Irwindale~~, and Azusa. Long-term impacts to socioeconomics could arise from the acquisition of properties for the proposed project, or if those acquisitions were to result in the loss of employment. As described in the Acquisitions and Displacements section (Section 3-1), implementation of the proposed project would occur under the auspices of the Uniform Act. The Uniform Act requires that acquisitions be made at fair market value and provides assistance for residential and business relocations caused by a federally-sponsored project. State- and local-level projects are also implemented under programs that are consistent with the Uniform Act.

For the Maintenance and Operations Facility, (which although located in Segment 1, would not be built as part of the Build LRT to Azusa Alternative) long-term socioeconomic changes could occur in Irwindale and nearby communities to the extent that businesses that would serve that facility may choose to locate

in those cities. If new or changed business activities were to occur, it can be assumed that the activities would have to comply with federal, state or local environmental regulations.

Foothill Extension, Segment 2 – The Cities Affected and the Results of Regulatory Compliance

The cities in ~~Phase II~~, Segment 2 are ~~Azusa~~, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, Montclair, and Upland. The potential long-term impacts are the same as described for Phase I (without the Maintenance and Operations Facility).

Summary of Long-term Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

For the Full Build (Pasadena to Montclair) Alternative, ~~Triple Track configuration~~, long-term impacts to socioeconomics could arise from the acquisition of properties for the proposed project, or if those acquisitions were to result in the loss of employment. Implementation of the proposed project would occur under the auspices of the Uniform Act. The Uniform Act requires that acquisitions be made at fair market value and provides assistance for residential and business relocations caused by a federally-sponsored project. State- and local-level projects are also implemented under programs that are consistent with the Uniform Act.

For the ~~Build LRT Alternative to Maintenance Facility~~ Build LRT to Azusa Alternative (Pasadena to Irwindale), the same potential long-term socioeconomic impacts associated with property acquisitions and displacements could occur. Implementation of the proposed project would occur under the auspices of the Uniform Act. The Uniform Act requires that acquisitions be made at fair market value and provides assistance for residential and business relocations caused by a federally sponsored project. State- and local-level projects are also implemented under programs that are consistent with the Uniform Act.

3-14.2.8 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations*, signed on February 11, 1994, directs federal agencies to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of federal projects and programs on minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. The term “minority” includes persons who identify themselves as Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, or of Hispanic origin. The term “low-income” includes persons whose household income is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines. A different threshold (e.g., U.S. Census Bureau poverty threshold) may be utilized as long as it is not selectively implemented and is inclusive of all persons at or below the HHS poverty guidelines.

The discussion of environmental justice that follows has been prepared in accordance with the applicable guidance for addressing environmental justice, including: DOT Order 5610.2 (April 15, 1997), FHWA Order 6640.23 (December 2, 1998), and FHWA Western Resource Center Interim Guidance (March 2, 1999). Consistent with this guidance, the environmental justice analysis for the proposed project describes: (1) the existing population and the presence of minority and low-income population groups; (2) potential adverse effects on the overall project area population, including minority and low-income population groups; (3) disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income population groups; and (4) community outreach and public involvement efforts.

(1) *Existing Population:* The demographic data collected at the City and census tract levels indicate that the proportions of minority and low-income populations throughout both Segment 1 and Segment 2 project areas are generally similar to those in the County of Los Angeles. Table 3-14.3 shows that the individual cities all contain substantial percentages of minority population groups. This ranges from a low of 33 percent minority to a high of 92 percent in Irwindale, which has a population of less than 1,500 persons. As shown in Table 3-14.5, 18 percent of Los Angeles County qualifies as low-income, while only the cities of Azusa and Pomona have higher percentages of low-income population (19 and 22 percent, respectively). In summary, most areas along the project corridor are characterized by a diverse, heterogeneous population typical of the Southern California region.

(2) *Effects on Overall Population:* The technical analyses by environmental topic conducted as part of the NEPA and CEQA processes have determined that the proposed project would result in potentially adverse effects during the construction period for air quality, biological resources, traffic and water quality. Potential construction period air impacts would occur along the entire right-of-way and at each proposed station/parking area, so impacts would be spread among all population groups along the corridor; no disproportionate impacts would occur. Potential biological impacts would occur at the proposed Maintenance and Operating Facility and at the station parking in Irwindale. However, there are no biological impacts to humans. Potential construction-period impacts would occur along the entire right-of-way and at each proposed station/parking area, so impacts would be spread among all population groups along the corridor; no disproportionate impacts would occur. Mitigation measures and regulatory compliance methods have been identified to address all of these construction period adverse effects. No long-term adverse effects were identified and no residual or unavoidable adverse effects are expected. Beneficial effects are expected for all population groups with respect to improved traffic circulation and mobility.

(3) *Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects on Minority and/or Low-Income Populations:* Taking into consideration the mitigation measures that have been proposed in the environmental document, the impact avoidance and minimization efforts that have occurred during the project planning and development process, and the potential benefits that would accrue to the community, environmental justice considerations require an assessment of whether the effects of the project on minority and low-income groups could be considered disproportionately high and adverse.

The determination of whether or not the effects of the proposed project are disproportionately high and adverse depends on whether (1) the effects of the project are predominately borne by a minority or low-income population, or (2) the effects of the project are appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude to minority or low-income populations compared to the effects on non-minority or non-low-income populations. See *FHWA Western Resource Center Interim Guidance – Addressing Environmental Justice in the EA/EIS* (1999). Using the potential construction period air quality impact issue as an example: potential impacts would occur along the entire right-of-way and at each proposed station/parking area, so impacts would be spread among all population groups along the corridor; no disproportionate impacts would occur. Since the adverse effects of the project would be fully mitigated, they would not be borne by any population group, including minority and low-income populations. Thus, no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations would result.

4) *Community Outreach and Public Involvement:* The proposed project is the culmination of prior planning studies that included input from public groups along the corridor. Additional outreach and involvement efforts are expected to continue as part of the ongoing environmental compliance and project development processes. Where necessary, these efforts will include mechanisms to reduce cultural, language, and economic barriers to participation. See Chapter 8.

Project planning has been, and the proposed project will be, developed in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which provides that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. In addition, the project will be developed in conformity with related statutes and regulations mandating that no person in the State of California shall, on grounds of race, color, sex, age, national origin, or disabling condition, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity administered by or on the behalf of the California State Department of Transportation.

The proposed project will continue to comply with applicable federal requirements promulgated in accordance with Executive Order 13166, *Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency* (August 11, 2000), which requires that federal programs and activities be accessible to persons with limited English language proficiency.

3-14.3 Mitigation

3-14.3.1 Construction Period Mitigation Measures

Construction period socioeconomic impacts would be eliminated or reduced to less than adverse under NEPA by ensuring that adequate access is provided to residential and business properties (see Section 3-1.1.1), so no additional measures to mitigate impacts are required. The No Build Alternative and the Build Alternatives do not require construction-period mitigation measures for socioeconomic impacts under NEPA.

However, under CEQA, construction period impacts that restrict access to properties are potentially significant. Additionally, members of the public are especially sensitive about changes in access to their residences or businesses. To address these concerns, the following preventative measures would be implemented, as well as an overall Traffic Management Plan.

- S-1** Schedules for street closures shall be developed in consultation with each corridor city.
- S-2** Advance notices shall be posted on city streets indicating when access will be closed or limited.
- S-3** Signs indicating access routes, alternate access points, and that affected business are open shall be posted.
- S-4** Newspaper notices shall be placed indicating street and access closures.
- S-5** The Construction Authority website shall include information on planned street and access closures.

3-14.3.2 Long-term Mitigation

All socioeconomic impacts would be not adverse (under NEPA)/ less than significant (under CEQA), and no mitigation measures would be required for any of the alternatives.

3-14.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

All socioeconomic impacts would be not adverse (under NEPA)/less than significant (under CEQA), and no mitigation measures would be required for any of the alternatives.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK