Executive Summary

This Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) analyzes the potential for significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed *County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan* (also referred to as the “Bicycle Master Plan,” the “Plan,” or “proposed project”) (Alta Planning + Design 2011; herein incorporated by reference).

The proposed Bicycle Master Plan would replace the 1975 *Plan of Bikeways*. The Bicycle Master Plan proposes a vision for a diverse regional bicycle system of interconnected bicycle corridors, support facilities, and programs to make bicycling more practical and desirable to a broader range of people in the County. It is intended to guide the development and maintenance of a comprehensive bicycle network and set of programs throughout the County’s unincorporated communities for the next 20 years.

Existing Conditions

The existing *Plan of Bikeways* for the County of Los Angeles was adopted in 1975 and amended in 1976 (Los Angeles County 1976). It is a component of the Transportation Element of the comprehensive *County of Los Angeles General Plan* (General Plan). The *Plan of Bikeways* consists of goals and policies, design standards, criteria for corridor selection, and implementation measures, along with mapping of bikeway corridor routes. It anticipated that each city within the County would adopt detailed feeder systems to supplement the County-wide network.

Currently, the Los Angeles County bikeway system includes approximately 144 miles of existing Class I bike paths, Class II bike lanes, and Class III bike routes. (For a definition of the bikeway types, see Chapter 2.)

Proposed Project

The Bicycle Master Plan would be a component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan, which is a long-range policy document that guides growth and development in the unincorporated portion of Los Angeles County. When the 2035 Los Angeles County General Plan Update is approved, the Bicycle Master Plan will be incorporated as a component of the Mobility Element.

The Bicycle Master Plan includes recommendations for an expanded bikeway network in unincorporated communities and along rivers, creeks, and flood control facilities throughout the County. It outlines a range of recommendations to facilitate accomplishing the regional goals of increasing the number of people who bike and the frequency of bicycle trips; encouraging the development of Complete Streets (see Chapter 2 for a description of the Complete Streets concept); improving safety for bicyclists; and increasing public awareness and support for bicycle-related programs.
Areas of Known Controversy

The proposed Bicycle Master Plan has few areas of known controversy. Two scoping meetings were held for the PEIR on April 19, 2011, at the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Headquarters at Union Station in Los Angeles (also known as the Gateway Center), with limited attendance (less than 10 total attendees), and few comments were received during the scoping period (April 4, 2011 to May 3, 2011). Most comments received related not to potential environmental impacts, but to the design of the various bikeways in the Plan itself. The only environmental issue raised in comments was potential visual impacts to existing recreational trails, which is addressed in this Draft PEIR in Section 3.1, “Aesthetics/Visual Resources.”

Issues to Be Resolved

The EIR for the Bicycle Master Plan is a Program EIR. A PEIR can be used to evaluate the impacts of agency plans, policies, or regulatory programs. PEIRs generally analyze broad environmental effects of the program with the acknowledgment that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular portions of the program when those portions are proposed for implementation and more information is available.

This document does not attempt to detail specific impacts that may occur from projects included in the Bicycle Master Plan, and could not do so because these facilities have yet to be designed. PEIRs generally analyze broad environmental effects of the program with the acknowledgment that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular portions of the program when those portions are proposed for implementation and more information is available. This document characterizes the types of impacts that could occur and provides mitigation measures that may be applied to individual projects, as needed. The significance of environmental impacts resulting from individual projects, and the need for implementation of mitigation measures, will be resolved in the environmental analyses at the project level, during the project design phase. This analysis will take place in Initial Studies or EIRs for individual projects or in Initial Studies or EIRs for larger roadway rehabilitation and improvement projects that include bikeways described in the Bicycle Master Plan.

Summary of Impacts

The analysis undertaken in support of this PEIR evaluated the plans and policies in the Bicycle Master Plan. The County prepared an Initial Study to determine which environmental topics needed to be addressed in the PEIR. Based on the Initial Study, the potential for significant impacts related to the following topics was assessed:

- Aesthetics and visual resources
- Biological resources
- Hydrology and water quality
- Cultural resources
Table ES-1 summarizes the impacts related to these issue areas and the potential mitigation that could be used to reduce these impacts during implementation of individual projects in the Bicycle Master Plan. The significance of impacts from individual projects and the applicability of mitigation measures to individual projects will be determined in environmental analyses at the project level.

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics/Visual Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.1-1:</strong> Be substantially visible from or obstruct views along a scenic highway, be located within a scenic corridor, or otherwise impact the viewshed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potentially significant impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permanent (operational) impacts of Class I bike paths to eligible scenic highways or highways officially designated in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permanent (operational) impacts of Class I bike paths in scenic viewsheds in San Fernando and Santa Clarita Valley Planning Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.1-1: Avoid view obstruction and alteration along scenic highways and corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.1-2: Design Class I bike paths to avoid visual impacts to scenic viewsheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of significance after mitigation:</strong> less than significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Impact 3.1-2:** Be substantially visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail. |
| **Potentially significant impacts** |
| • Permanent (operational) impacts of Class I bike paths visible from regional riding or hiking trails. |
| **Mitigation** |
| • MM 3.1-3: Design Class I bike paths to avoid visual impacts to regional riding or hiking trails. |
| **Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant. |
**Biological Resources**

*Impact 3.2-1: Be located within a SEA, SEA Buffer, or coastal ESHA, or is relatively undisturbed and natural.*

**Potentially significant impacts**
- Removal/disturbance of vegetation (including habitat)
- Alteration of surface drainage patterns.
- Noise and light disturbance and dust deposition.
- Increased human and pet presence.
- Increased potential of exotic species invasion due to soil disturbance.

**Mitigation**
- **MM 3.2-1:** Obtain agency permits/approvals.
- **MM 3.2-2:** Protect sensitive habitat areas from harmful exposure to light.
- **MM 3.2-3:** Avoid impacts on nesting birds and raptors.
- **MM 3.2-4:** Conduct biological monitoring.
- **MM 3.2-5:** Delineate sensitive habitat areas.
- **MM 3.2-6:** Install signage and fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers to prevent impacts on adjacent areas during operation

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

*Impact 3.2-2: Be located within a drainage course that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake.*

**Potentially significant impacts**
- Removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other disturbance
- Increased human and pet presence.
- Degradation of functions and values of drainage courses from accumulation of trash and debris.

**Mitigation**
- **MM 3.2-1:** Obtain agency permits/approvals.
- **MM 3.2-4:** Conduct biological monitoring.
- **MM 3.2-5:** Delineate sensitive habitat areas.
- **MM 3.2-6:** Install signage and fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers to prevent impacts on adjacent areas during operation

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
### Impact 3.2-3: Be located in a major riparian or other sensitive habitat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Removal of habitat.</td>
<td>• MM 3.2-1: Obtain agency permits/approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased potential of exotic species invasion due to soil disturbance.</td>
<td>• MM 3.2-2: Protect sensitive habitat areas from harmful exposure to light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deposition of dust during construction.</td>
<td>• MM 3.2-3: Avoid impacts on nesting birds and raptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased human and pet presence.</td>
<td>• MM 3.2-4: Conduct biological monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Degradation resulting from accumulation of trash and debris.</td>
<td>• MM 3.2-5: Delineate sensitive habitat areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

### Impact 3.2-4: Be located near oak or other unique native trees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Removal of trees.</td>
<td>• MM 3.2-1: Obtain agency permits/approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.2-2: Protect sensitive habitat areas from harmful exposure to light.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.2-3: Avoid impacts on nesting birds and raptors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.2-4: Conduct biological monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.2-5: Delineate sensitive habitat areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.2-6: Install signage and fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers to prevent impacts on adjacent areas during operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MM 3.2-7: Replace native trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
**Impact 3.2-5: Be located in habitat for any known sensitive species.**

**Potentially significant impacts**
- Removal of suitable/occupied habitat.
- Degradation of suitable/occupied habitat as a result of increased human and pet presence, dust during construction, and potential invasion of exotic species due to soil disturbance.
- Increase noise during construction.
- Increased light disturbance.

**Mitigation**
- **MM 3.2-1:** Obtain agency permits/approvals.
- **MM 3.2-2:** Protect sensitive habitat areas from harmful exposure to light.
- **MM 3.2-3:** Avoid impacts on nesting birds and raptors.
- **MM 3.2-4:** Conduct biological monitoring.
- **MM 3.2-5:** Delineate sensitive habitat areas.
- **MM 3.2-6:** Install signage and fencing, vegetation, or other natural barriers to prevent impacts on adjacent areas during operation.

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

### Hydrology/Water Quality

**Impact 3.3-1: Be located within a major drainage course on the project site.**

**Potentially significant impacts**
- Construction within drainage channels, in-water construction, use of methods such as sheet-pile coffer dams, or diversion of rivers/creeks.
- Alteration of surface drainage patterns.

**Mitigation**
- **MM 3.3-1:** Design projects to avoid impacts to drainage courses.

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

**Impact 3.3-2: Be located within a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone.**

**Potentially significant impacts**
- Impede or redirect flood flows.

**Mitigation**
- **MM 3.3-2:** Design projects to ensure project will not increase the size of the floodplain.

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

**Impact 3.3-3: Degradation of the quality of stormwater runoff from pre-development and post-development activities, and contribution of potential pollutants to the stormwater conveyance system or receiving bodies from post-development non-stormwater discharges.**

**Potentially significant impacts**
- Increase in impervious surface in sensitive areas.
- Trash deposition resulting in impact to water quality.

**Mitigation**
- **MM 3.3-3:** Design appropriate drainage features to prevent erosion.
- **MM 3.3-4:** Design appropriate drainage features to prevent flow into rivers or creeks.
- **MM 3.3-5:** Provide appropriate trash management methods.

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
### Cultural Resources

**Impact 3.4-1: Be in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Earth moving could result in destruction of archaeological resources.</td>
<td>• MM 3.4-1: Implement treatment plan based on site-specific surveys prior to earth-moving activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

**Impact 3.4-2: Contains known historic structures or sites.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Disturb historic architectural resources.</td>
<td>• MM 3.4-2: Avoid significant historical resources identified in site-specific surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

**Impact 3.4-3: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Disturbance or property damage as a result of construction adversely affecting historic or archaeological resource. | • MM 3.4-1: Implement treatment plan based on site-specific surveys prior to earth-moving activities.  
• MM 3.4-2: Avoid significant historical resources identified in site-specific surveys. |

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.

### Hazards/Hazardous Materials

**Impact 3.5-1: Previous uses that indicated residual soil toxicity of the site and/or the site is located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially significant impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Exposure to contaminated groundwater or other hazards from excavation.</td>
<td>• MM 3.5-1: Take appropriate action based on a Preliminary Environmental Site Screening and follow-up studies for projects requiring soil disturbance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of significance after mitigation:** less than significant.
Impact 3.5-2: Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

Potentially significant impacts
- Exposure to hazardous materials at recorded hazardous sites.
- Exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos during demolition.
- Exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) during construction.

Mitigation
- MM 3.5-2: Take appropriate actions based on Lead-Based Paint and Asbestos-Containing Building Materials Surveys for Projects Requiring Demolition of Structures.
- MM 3.5-3: Take appropriate actions based on PCB Survey for Projects Requiring Demolition of Structures.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.

Traffic and Transportation

Impact 3.6-1: Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic volumes and capacity of the roadway system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) or exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roadways or highways.

Potentially significant impacts
- Construction-related congestions resulting in temporary traffic levels that exceed applicable LOS standards.
- Reduction in vehicular travel lanes (road diets) to add bike lanes (Class II), reducing LOS.

Mitigation
- MM 3.6-1: Implement a Traffic Control Plan.
- MM 3.6-2: Implement site-specific traffic study recommendations.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.

Impact 3.6-2: Result in hazardous traffic conditions.

Potentially significant impacts
- Construction-generated traffic resulting in safety impacts where roadways restrictions, lane closures, and similar conditions occur.

Mitigation
- MM 3.6-1: Implement a Traffic Control Plan.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.

Impact 3.6-3: Result in Parking Problems with a Subsequent Impact on Traffic Conditions.

Potentially significant impacts
- Removal of parking to accommodate new Class II bike lanes.

Mitigation
- MM 3.6-1: Implement a Traffic Control Plan.
- MM 3.6-3: Implement site-specific parking study recommendations.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.
Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

**Impact 3.7-1:** Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Impact 3.7-2:** Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Impact 3.7-3:** Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Impact 3.7-4:** Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Potentially significant impacts
- Increases in GHG emissions contributing to significant adverse environment impacts during construction.

Mitigation
- MM 3.7-1: Meet Tier 2 standards for engine/equipment emissions during construction.
- MM 3.7-2: Turn off equipment when not in use.
- MM 3.7-3: Use existing electricity infrastructure.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.

**Impact 3.7-5:** Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mineral Resources

**Impact 3.8-1:** Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Potentially significant impacts
- Disruption or removal of existing extraction operations or precluding future extraction of resources.

Mitigation
- MM 3.8-1: Implement measures to protect existing mineral resource and oil and gas resource operations in the vicinity of Bicycle Master Plan projects.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.

**Impact 3.8-2:** Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Potentially significant impacts
- Affect ability to access future locally designated resources.

Mitigation
- MM 3.8-1: Implement measures to protect existing mineral resource and oil and gas resource operations in the vicinity of Bicycle Master Plan projects.

Level of significance after mitigation: less than significant.
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