5.1 Introduction

This section of the PEIR describes alternatives to the proposed Bicycle Master Plan. Alternatives have been analyzed consistent with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which requires evaluation of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but could potentially avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project.

5.2 Project Objectives

The objective of the Bicycle Master Plan is to provide the following benefits:

- Environmental and Climate Change Benefits: Fewer vehicular trips result in fewer mobile source and greenhouse gas pollutants, thereby improving air quality.
- Public Health Benefits: Bicycling encourages active lifestyles and creates a means for physical activity.
- Economic Benefits: Bicycling involves fewer operating costs and travel expenses than automobile commutes. The cost of bicycle infrastructure is less than automobile infrastructure.
- Community/Quality of Life Benefits: Built environments that promote bicycling are more socially active, civically engaged, and aesthetically pleasing.
- Safety Benefits: Well-designed bicycle facilities improve security for cyclists and encourage more people to bike, which in turn, can further improve bicycling safety.

5.3 Alternatives Considered but Rejected

The selection process for determining areas of proposed bicycle facility improvements included extensive public outreach and consultation with County staff through meetings with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)—which consists of the County of Los Angeles Departments of Beaches and Harbors, Parks and Recreation, Public Health, Public Works, and Regional Planning—and monthly meetings with the Bicycle Advisory Committee. Three rounds of public workshops were held to present the Plan's initial findings and recommendations to the public and to provide opportunities for public input and feedback. During this process the Bicycle Master Plan went through many revisions until the current draft Bicycle Master Plan was developed ("the project" for the purposes of this PEIR).

It would be possible to consider any of these previous revisions as alternatives for this alternatives analysis. However, these would be more "variations" of the project than discreet alternatives, especially considering the broad-scale analysis presented in this PEIR. In addition, each version was

previously rejected during the planning process for various reasons. Therefore, these previous versions are rejected as alternatives for this environmental analysis.

5.4 Alternatives Analyzed

A total of three alternatives to the project are considered in this PEIR:

- No Project Alternative.
- Alternative 1: No Class I Bike Paths Plan
- Alternative 2: Reduced Class II Bike Lanes Plan

5.4.1 No Project Alternative

Description of the No Project Alternative

An EIR must always evaluate and analyze the impact of not approving the proposed project, or the No Project Alternative. In this case, the No Project Alternative would be the continued use of the existing *Plan of Bikeways* for the County of Los Angeles that was adopted in 1975 and amended in 1976 (Los Angeles County 1976). No additional goals or policies would be adopted, and no new Class I, II, or III bikeways or bike boulevards would be planned. (Some recommendations for bikeway projects in the *Plan of Bikeways* have not been implemented and are not feasible, are outside the jurisdiction of the County, or do not meet the current needs of the biking public. Therefore, the No Project Alternative assumes the existing bikeway network, without further implementation of projects in the 1975/1976 plan.) The County would continue to maintain the existing bicycle facilities network, including 100.3 miles of Class I bike paths, 20.2 miles of Class II bike lanes, and 23.5 miles of Class III bike routes.

Objectives and Feasibility

The No Project Alternative is based on the existing *Plan of Bikeways*, last amended in 1976. It would not result in any of the Bicycle Master Plan's benefits, which are the objective of the proposed project. It would not result in environmental and climate change benefits because it would not reduce vehicular trips in comparison with existing conditions. It would not provide public health benefits because it would not encourage active lifestyles or create additional means for physical activity. It would not result in economic benefits from reduced automobile expense and infrastructure costs. The No Project Alternative would not result in community or quality of life benefits from increased bicycle use. Finally, it would not provide safety benefits that would be derived from new, well-designed bikeways.

The No Project Alternative would be economically feasible because there would be no additional direct costs associated with not approving the Bicycle Master Plan or implementing bicycle projects. However, the costs associated with additional automobile infrastructure necessitated by the lack of bicycle infrastructure would continue to increase.

The existing *Plan of Bikeways* would not be compatible with the Draft 2035 General Plan Update, which intends to incorporate the Bicycle Master Plan into its Mobility Element when approved.

Comparative Impacts

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts to scenic highways, scenic viewsheds, and regional riding and hiking trails, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Biological Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts to SEAs, SEA Buffers, coastal ESHAs, and relatively undisturbed and natural areas, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Project Alternative would also have fewer impacts to drainage courses; riparian and other sensitive habitats; native trees, including oaks; and sensitive species. Again, significant impacts to these resources would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but mitigation is available to reduce the impacts of these projects to less-than-significant level.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts to major drainages, floodways, floodplains, or designated flood hazard zones, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Project Alternative would also have fewer impacts to stormwater runoff because it would not introduce new impervious surfaces. Again, though significant impacts to water quality would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, mitigation is available to reduce the impacts of these projects to a less-than-significant level. Impacts related to trash deposition affecting water quality would be less for the No Project Alternative where there are no existing bikeway facilities. However, mitigation measures to provide appropriate trash management methods would not be implemented, as they would be with the Bicycle Master Plan projects, so in some locations the impacts would be worse with the No Project Alternative (i.e., the Bicycle Master Plan mitigation would result in an improvement when compared to the existing conditions).

Cultural Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative, which includes no construction, would result in fewer impacts to archaeological and historic resources, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative, which includes no construction, would result in fewer impacts related to exposure to contaminated groundwater, hazardous materials sites, lead-based paint, asbestos, and PCBs, which would potentially occur with some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. After mitigation, the remediated sites would be less hazardous than the existing condition, a benefit that would not occur under the No Project Alternative.

Traffic and Transportation

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative, which includes no construction, would result in fewer impacts related to reduced LOS during construction, which would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. The No Project Alternative would not result in a reduction in the number of vehicular travel lanes because no new Class II bike lanes would be constructed. The Bicycle Master Plan projects would reduce vehicular lanes and also reduce LOS in some cases, but mitigation is available to reduce the LOS impact to less than significant. Because the No Project Alternative would not include construction, it would also not create any construction-related traffic safety impacts, which may occur for some projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation is available to reduce the safety hazard impacts to less than significant. Finally, the No Project Alternative would not remove any parking, which would occur for some project in the Bicycle Master Plan, resulting in significant parking impacts in some cases. However, mitigation is available to reduce the parking impacts of the Bicycle Master Plan to less-than-significant levels.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer construction-related impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions, which would be significant for the Bicycle Master Plan, but which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation. To the extent that fewer bikeways would be available for alternate, no-emissions commuting under the No Project Alternative, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would be worse than for the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mineral Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer construction-related impacts to mineral resources, which would be potentially significant for some projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation.

5.4.2 Alternative 1: No Class I Bike Paths Plan

Description of Alternative 1

For the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, impacts generally fall into two main categories: impacts associated with "off-road" bikeways, primarily Class I bike paths; and impacts associated with "on-

road" bikeways, Class II and III bikeways and bike boulevards. Alternative 1, the No Class I Bike Paths Plan, would include only Class II and III bikeways and bike boulevards, thereby eliminating the impacts associated with Class I bike paths.

The same policies and goals would be included in Alternative 1 as in the Bicycle Master Plan. All of the Class II and III bikeways and bike boulevards that are included in the Bicycle Master Plan would also be included in alternative, but the Class I bike paths would not be included.

Objectives and Feasibility

Alternative 1 would result in some but not all of Bicycle Master Plan's benefits, which are the objective of the proposed project. It would result in reduced environmental and climate change benefits related to reducing vehicular trips because there would be fewer bikeways constructed. Because no Class I bike paths would be constructed, Alternative 1 would not provide as many public health benefits through encouraging active lifestyles or creating additional means for physical activity because the recreational uses are primarily provided by the Class I bike paths. Alternative 1 would result in similar, if slightly reduced, economic benefits from reduced automobile expense and infrastructure costs because the bike lanes and bike routes used mostly by commuters would be also be part of Alternative 1. This alternative would not result in as many community or quality of life benefits from increased bicycle use because the most aesthetically pleasing facilities—the Class I bike paths—would not be part of this alternative. Finally, it would not provide as many safety benefits as the Bicycle Master Plan because the safest bikeways are those that are physically separated from vehicular roadways, and Class I bike paths would not be included.

Alternative 1 would be economically feasible.

Comparative Impacts

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 1 would result in fewer impacts to scenic highways, scenic viewsheds, and regional riding and hiking trails because it would not include the Class I bike paths that would potentially significantly affect these resources under the Bicycle Master Plan. However, mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Biological Resources

Because Alternative 1 would not include Class I bike paths, it would result in fewer impacts to SEAs, SEA Buffers, coastal ESHAs, and relatively undisturbed and natural areas, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 1 would also have fewer impacts to drainage courses; riparian and other sensitive habitats; native trees, including oaks; and sensitive species. Again, significant impacts to these resources would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but mitigation is available to reduce the impacts of these projects to a less-than-significant level.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Because Alternative 1 would not include Class I bike paths, it would result in fewer impacts to major drainages, floodways, floodplains, or designated flood hazard zones, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 1 would also have fewer impacts to stormwater runoff because it would introduce fewer new impervious surfaces. Again, though significant impacts to water quality would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, mitigation is available to reduce the impacts of these projects to less-than-significant level. Impacts related to trash deposition affecting water quality would be less for Alternative 1 without the Class I bike paths.

Cultural Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 1 would be expected to have slightly fewer impacts to archaeological resources because less ground disturbance would be involved in areas with high sensitivity to archaeological resources (i.e., along water courses). Impacts to historic resources, however, would likely be similar to those for the Bicycle Master Plan because most of these resources are located adjacent to existing roadways where Class II and III bikeways and bike boulevards would be located. The Bicycle Master Plan or Alternative 1 would potentially significantly affect historic architectural resources, but mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 1 would result in fewer impacts related to exposure to contaminated groundwater, which would be most likely to occur for the construction of new bridges associated with Class I bike paths. However, Alternative 1 impacts related to hazardous materials sites, lead-based paint, asbestos, and PCBs, which are most likely to occur on properties adjacent to existing roadways, would be similar to those for the Bicycle Master Plan and would be potentially significant, but mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Traffic and Transportation

Alternative 1 impacts related to reduced LOS during construction would be similar to the Bicycle Master Plan and would be potentially significant for some of the projects, but mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Either Alternative 1 or the Bicycle Master Plan would result in a reduction in the number of vehicular travel lanes due to the construction of Class II bike lanes, with potential reduction in LOS in some cases; mitigation is available to reduce the LOS impact to less than significant. Either Alternative 1 or the Bicycle Master Plan would potentially create construction-related traffic safety impacts, but mitigation is available to reduce the safety hazard impacts to less than significant. Either Alternative 1 or the Bicycle Master Plan would remove some parking, resulting in significant parking impacts in some cases. However, mitigation is available to reduce the parking impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 1 would result in slightly fewer construction-related impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions because no Class I bike paths would be constructed, which would be significant for the Bicycle Master Plan, but which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation. To the extent that fewer bikeways would be available for alternate, no-emissions commuting under Alternative 1, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would be worse than for the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mineral Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 1 would result in slightly fewer construction-related impacts to mineral resources, which would be potentially significant for some projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation.

5.4.3 Alternative 2: Reduced Class II Bike Lanes Plan

Description of Alternative 2

As described above, impacts from the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan generally fall into two main categories: impacts associated with off-road bikeways, primarily Class I bike paths; and impacts associated with on-road bikeways—Class II and III bikeways and bike boulevards. Alternative 2, Reduced Class II Bike Lanes Plan, would reduce the number of Class II bike lanes, thereby reducing the impacts associated with on-road bikeways.

The same policies and goals would be included in Alternative 2 as in the Bicycle Master Plan. All of the Class I bike paths, Class III bike routes, and bike boulevards that are included in the Bicycle Master Plan would also be included in this alternative. However, any Class II bike lanes that would require removal of vehicular lanes or parking would not be included in Alternative 2.

Objectives and Feasibility

Alternative 2 would result in some but not all of Bicycle Master Plan's benefits, which are the objective of the proposed project. It would result in reduced environmental and climate change benefits related to reducing vehicular trips because there would be fewer bikeways constructed. Alternative 2 would also reduce the public health benefits by reducing the overall number of bikeways available, compared to the Bicycle Master Plan. Alternative 2 would result in similar, if slightly reduced, economic benefits from reduced automobile expense and infrastructure costs. This alternative would slightly reduce the community or quality of life benefits from increased bicycle use. Finally, it would not provide as many safety benefits as the Bicycle Master Plan because of the reduced number of striped bike lanes provided under this alternative.

Alternative 2 would be economically feasible.

Comparative Impacts

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Impacts to scenic highways, scenic viewsheds, and regional riding and hiking trails would be similar to those for the Bicycle Master Plan because the significant visual impacts would be associated with Class I bike paths, which are also included in Alternative 2. However, mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Biological Resources

Because Alternative 2 would include the same Class I bike paths as the Bicycle Master Plan, it would result in similar impacts to SEAs, SEA Buffers, coastal ESHAs, and relatively undisturbed and natural areas, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also have similar impacts to drainage courses; riparian and other sensitive habitats; native trees, including oaks; and sensitive species. Again, significant impacts to these resources would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but mitigation is available to reduce the impacts of these projects to less-than-significant level.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Because Alternative 2 would include the same Class I bike paths as the Bicycle Master Plan, it would result in similar impacts to major drainages, floodways, floodplains, or designated flood hazard zones, which are potentially significantly affected by some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but for which mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 2 would also have similar impacts to stormwater runoff because it would introduce similar amounts of new impervious surfaces. Again, though significant impacts to water quality would potentially occur for some of the projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, mitigation is available to reduce the impacts of these projects to a less-than-significant level. Impacts related to trash deposition affecting water quality for Alternative 2 would be similar to the Bicycle Master Plan.

Cultural Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 2 would be expected to have similar impacts to archaeological resources because the ground disturbance would be similar in areas with high sensitivity to archaeological resources (i.e., along water courses). Impacts to historic resources, however, would also be similar to those for the Bicycle Master Plan because not eliminating vehicular lanes or parking, as proposed under Alternative 2, would make little difference for these types of resources. Either the Bicycle Master Plan or Alternative 2 would potentially significantly affect historic architectural resources, but mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts related to exposure to contaminated groundwater, which would be mostly likely to occur for the construction

of new bridges associated with Class I bike paths. Alternative 2 impacts related to hazardous materials sites, lead-based paint, asbestos, and PCBs, which are most likely to occur on properties adjacent to existing roadways, would be similar to those for the Bicycle Master Plan and would be potentially significant, but mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Traffic and Transportation

Alternative 2 impacts related to reduced LOS during construction would be slightly reduced compared to the Bicycle Master Plan because fewer lane closures would be required. Impacts of either Alternative 2 or the Bicycle Master Plan would be potentially significant for some of the projects, but mitigation would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Unlike the Bicycle Master Plan, however, Alternative 2 would not result in a reduction in the number of vehicular travel lanes due to the construction of Class II bike lanes, so the potential reduction in LOS would be less; mitigation is available to reduce the LOS impact for the Bicycle Master Plan to less than significant. Alternative 2 would potentially create slightly fewer construction-related traffic safety impacts, but mitigation is available to reduce the safety hazard impacts of the Bicycle Master Plan to less than significant. Unlike the Bicycle Master Plan, however, Alternative 2 would not remove parking, which would result in significant parking impacts in some cases under the Bicycle Master Plan. However, mitigation is available to reduce the parking impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 2 would result in slightly fewer construction-related impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions because there would be slightly fewer Class II bike lanes constructed. Under either Alternative 2 or the Bicycle Master Plan, impacts would be significant, but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation. To the extent that fewer bikeways would be available for alternate, no-emissions commuting under Alternative 2, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would be worse than for the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mineral Resources

Compared to the Bicycle Master Plan, Alternative 2 would result in slightly fewer construction-related impacts to mineral resources, which would be potentially significant for some projects in the Bicycle Master Plan, but which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation.

This page intentionally left blank.