

## 3-16 UTILITY DISRUPTIONS AND RELOCATIONS

### 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

For the No-Build Alternative, no substantial utility relocations are expected.

For the LRT Alternatives, utilities that traverse the rail ~~ROW~~ right-of-way (i.e., cross at an angle) would generally be protected in place. The specific utilities affected and the type of protection would be determined during Preliminary Engineering. Affected utility providers would be consulted to determine the appropriate type of protection needed. Utilities that run within the ~~ROW~~ right-of-way under the terms of a franchise agreement would be relocated at the specific utility's expense.

### 3-16.1 Existing Conditions

The purpose of this section is to assess potential utility impacts within existing and proposed ~~LACMTA~~ Construction Authority-owned right-of-way (ROW) and within the street ROW at grade crossings. For the purpose of discussing utilities, the Gold Line ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension alignment can be presented as ~~five~~ four distinct areas of assessment:

1. The alignment within median of the I-210 Freeway (in Segment 1)
2. The former AT&SF Pasadena Subdivision ROW between Pasadena and Montclair (in Segments 1 and 2). This ROW is owned by the Construction Authority in Los Angeles County and by SANBAG in San Bernardino County.
3. Additional public or private land required along the rail ROW (in Segments 1 and 2). ~~The abandoned former Pacific Electric ROW in Claremont and Montclair/Upland (Segment 2 only). This ROW is owned by LACMTA in Los Angeles County and by SANBAG in San Bernardino County.~~
4. The ~~34~~24-acre site of the Maintenance and Operations (M&O) facility in the City of Irwindale (Segment 1).

As mentioned, each of the ~~five~~ four areas of utility assessment ~~will be~~ is discussed regarding: a) impact to the Build Alternatives, b) party responsible for relocation, if required, and c) the general magnitude of cost to mitigate the impact.

## 3-16.2 Environmental Impacts

### 3-16.2.1 Evaluation Methodology

The utility assessment focused on identifying potential impacts to the proposed Build Alternatives and the party responsible for relocation, if required.

### 3-16.2.2 Impact Criteria

#### *a. NEPA Impact Criteria*

NEPA does not include impact criteria for utility disruptions and relocations. Therefore, CEQA impact criteria will also be used to determine impacts under NEPA.

#### *b. CEQA Impact Criteria*

The following significance thresholds relative to utilities are drawn for the CEQA Guidelines:

Would the project:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- Adversely affect or interfere with the provision of public utility services?

### 3-16.2.3 Construction-Period Impacts

#### *a. No-Build Alternative*

##### 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 Extension, implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT, and countywide bus service improvements. Only the Eastside Extension and new traction power substations in Phase I, would have construction-period impacts to utilities. Both projects are being implemented by LACMTA. For the Eastside Extension, impacts are identified, along with mitigations measures to reduce them to less than adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA, in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FTA and LACMTA, 2001). There are no construction elements associated with Foothill Extension or bus service improvements that would result in utility disruptions or relocations under the No-Build scenario.

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

The cities in Phase II Foothill Extension, Segment 1 are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, and Azusa. The projects in the No-Build Alternative affecting these cities during the Phase II Foothill Extension construction period are (1) implementation of increased service on Phase I of the Gold Line LRT and (2) countywide bus service improvements. There are no construction elements associated with these service improvements that would result in utility disruptions or relocations.

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

The cities in Phase II Foothill Extension, 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 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 is in San Bernardino County, ~~they are it is~~ affected by changes in Los Angeles County bus service because that service is linked to the Montclair TransCenter. There are no construction elements associated with this service improvement that would result in utility disruptions or relocations.

#### *b. Build Alternatives*

Impacts to utilities cannot be accurately defined since only conceptual-level design is available (as of August 2005). In general, the following types of impacts would be expected. Construction of the trackway, stations and other facilities would require relocating, abandoning, or otherwise avoiding some infrastructure elements. These could include relocation of utility poles supporting overhead wires and streetlights; relocation of underground utilities from the track zone, station areas and maintenance facility site; and repair and/or encasement of underground utilities at track crossings. Existing utilities have been identified during development of the Final EIR/EIS. In general, utilities crossing the railroad right-of-way are already protected, and utilities work is anticipated to be mainly extension of existing protection to the right-of-way limits. The maintenance facility in Irwindale is anticipated to require new utilities. Relocation of existing utilities is not anticipated.

The impacts of utility work would be localized, occurring generally at or near at-grade street crossings where gas and water lines typically traverse the rail right-of-way at right angles. Other areas of utility construction would be where drainageways cross the rail right-of-way. The magnitude of construction is not expected to be great, and would be similar to that experienced in urban areas when utilities must be repaired. It would be expected that utility relocation work in any particular location would occur over a period of less than one week. The main types of impacts that would be likely to occur would be disruption of traffic as lanes are closed to allow work, and perhaps temporary losses of service as lines are moved or connections changed.

### Phase I – The Cities Affected and the Effects

The cities in Phase I are Los Angeles, South Pasadena, and Pasadena. There are no construction elements associated with the Build Alternative in these cities, and, therefore, no impacts to utilities.

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

The cities in ~~Phase II~~ Foothill Extension, Segment I are Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, and Azusa. Within the median of I-210 (Pasadena and Arcadia), two new LRT tracks would be placed directly over old railroad grade and a parallel service road. The old under drain system would be replaced and the new pipes would be reconnected to existing outlet conduits and structures constructed in the early 1970's as part of the freeway/railway project. Since the old grade will be used throughout, and the LRT loading is significantly less severe than that of the railroad, any existing transverse utilities would continue to be adequately protected in place. The specific utilities affected and the type of protection would be determined during ~~Preliminary Engineering~~ Final Design. Affected utility providers would be consulted to determine the appropriate type of protection needed. Old railroad communication lines within the existing ROW are considered abandoned and would be replaced with LRT communication and signaling systems.

Between the alignment crossing of I-210 near Baldwin Avenue in Arcadia and the Miller Brewery in Irwindale ~~proposed Monrovia station~~, only two tracks are required. From ~~Monrovia~~ the Miller Brewery eastward, two LRT tracks would generally be placed on a new grade relatively close to the existing or relocated freight track. Since the swath of loading impact for the Build Alternatives would be considerably wider than that of the existing track, ~~some vast majority of~~ many are already protected to the right-of-way limits ~~and significant stretches of parallel utilities~~ may ~~would likely~~ require additional protection. The specific utilities affected and the type of protection would be determined during ~~Preliminary Engineering~~ Final Design. Affected utility providers would be consulted to determine the appropriate type of protection needed during Final Design. All utility (franchise) agreements with the ~~BNSF AT&SF~~ (and later LACMTA) clearly indicate that the cost of any required relocation would be borne by the utility owner. Old railroad communication and signal lines within the existing ~~LACMTA~~ Construction Authority-owned ROW would be replaced with new LRT communication and signal lines.

The proposed Maintenance and Operation Facility in Irwindale would be built on undeveloped land that has been previously used for rock quarry operations. There are no known utilities other than drainage channels or storm drain systems that would be affected. These channels/systems would likely be removed and subsumed into new facilities designed for the M&O center; any demands associated with adjoining properties would be incorporated. It is assumed that the full range of utilities (water, sewer, electrical service, telephone, etc.) would be needed to serve the M&O facility. In general, these utilities would be connected to existing area service lines, in accordance with all necessary federal and state regulatory requirements.

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

The cities in ~~Phase II Foothill Extension~~, Segment 2 are ~~Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair and Upland~~. In these cities, two LRT tracks would generally be placed on a new grade relatively close to the existing or relocated freight track. Since the swath of loading impact for the Build Alternatives would be considerably wider than that of the existing track, ~~some vast majority of transverse utilities (many are already protected to the right-of-way limits) and significant stretches of parallel utilities) may would likely~~ require additional protection. The specific utilities affected and the type of protection would be determined during ~~Preliminary Engineering~~ Final Design. Affected utility providers would be consulted to determine the appropriate type of protection needed during Final Design. All utility (franchise) agreements with the ~~BNSF AT&SF~~ (and later LACMTA) clearly indicate that the cost of any required relocation would be borne by the utility owner. Old railroad communication and signal lines within the existing ~~LACMTA~~ Construction Authority-owned ROW would be replaced with new LRT communication and signal lines

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

Utilities that traverse the rail ROW (i.e., cross at an angle) would generally be protected in place. The specific utilities affected and the type of protection would be determined during ~~Preliminary Engineering~~ Final Design. Affected utility providers would be consulted to determine the appropriate type of protection needed. ~~In Duarte, utility relocations would be required due to the need to acquire about 7 feet from the Duarte Road ROW.~~ Utilities that run within the ROW under the terms of a franchise agreement would be relocated at specific utility's expense.

Summary of Impacts for Build LRT to Azusa Alternative

Utilities that traverse the rail ROW (i.e., cross at an angle) would generally be protected in place. The specific utilities affected and the type of protection would be determined during ~~Preliminary Engineering~~ Final Design. Affected utility providers would be consulted to determine the appropriate type of protection needed. ~~In Duarte, utility relocations would be required due to the need to acquire about 7 feet from the Duarte Road ROW.~~ Utilities that run within the ROW under the terms of a franchise agreement would be relocated at specific utility's expense.

3-16.2.4 Long-Term Impacts

Utility disruptions and relocations due to the project would occur only during the construction phase. There are no elements of any of the alternatives that would be likely to generate substantially increased demands on local utilities in the long term. (The effects of the proposed project on energy demand are addressed in Section 3-7.)

3-16.2.5 Cumulative Impacts

The Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Final Program EIR is the most applicable certified planning document that provides a regional cumulative impact assessment for transportation improvements (including the proposed project) through the year 2030. Cumulative impacts to utilities could arise from the ongoing growth of the region, as characterized in SCAG's 2004 RTP. The proposed project is accounted for in SCAG's 2030 forecasts of regional growth. Although these transportation projects may influence the location of development or redevelopment, they are not likely to induce additional, unaccounted-for utility demands. Temporary,

short-term service disruptions could occur during construction, but would not be considered significant with respect to regional cumulative impacts.

~~Cumulative impacts to utilities could arise from the ongoing growth of the region. As individual residential and commercial projects are implemented over time, they place incremental demands on utilities. The transportation improvements included in the No Build and LRT Alternatives are all included in SCAG's 2025 forecast of regional growth and in the plans of individual cities. Although these transportation projects may influence the location of development or redevelopment, they are not likely to induce additional, unaccounted for utility demands. (The effects of the proposed project on energy demand are addressed in Section 3-7.)~~

### 3-16.2.6 Impacts Addressed by Regulatory Compliance

#### *a. Construction-Period Impacts*

There are no federal, state, or local regulatory measures for utility disruptions and relocations during the construction period. It is assumed that all regulatory requirements that are being met by a particular utility (e.g., water quality) would be maintained during the construction process for all alternatives. Mitigation measures related to coordination with utility providers, which would include provisions to ensure any regulatory requirements associated with a functioning infrastructure element are met, are described in Section 3-16.3.

#### *b. Long-Term Impacts*

There are no federal, state, or local regulatory measures for utility disruptions and relocations during the operational period for any of the alternatives. Operation of any of the alternatives would not include a need to relocate or disrupt utilities.

## 3-16.3 Mitigation

### 3-16.3.1 Construction-Period Mitigation Measures

The locations of existing utilities have already been identified during development of the Final EIR/EIS. ~~During Preliminary Engineering Final Design, work would be conducted at a level of specificity to identify the precise locations of utilities to be relocated, the type~~ typical types of protection-in-place and the requirements for maintaining operations during construction will be developed. It is recognized that utility relocation or protection-in-place must include consultation with utility operators to avoid or minimize the potential for disruptions of service. The Construction Authority, LACMTA, and SANBAG will require that the following measures be imposed during design and construction.

**U-1** The Construction Authority, LACMTA, and SANBAG, or their agents, shall work with utility providers to minimize any potential service interruptions and shall conserve resources by:

**U-2** Complying with applicable utility policies and strategies as specified in the adopted operational comprehensive plans of the corridor cities and counties of Los Angeles and San Bernardino, including those provisions related to levels of service, conservation strategies, and coordination of service provisions.

**U-3** Incorporating County of Los Angeles and California State energy code, building code, fire code, LACMTA Design Criteria and Standards (Volume I through IV) and other application

requirements for all design aspects of the system, stations, maintenance facility, and parking areas.

**U-4** Developing methods including cathodic protection to reduce the effects of stray currents. Where necessary and possible, install devices to reduce the impact of stray current between the traction power system and the utility facilities, or replaced particularly metallic utility infrastructure with nonmetallic materials.

**U-5** Coordinating with affected water utilities and local fire departments to ensure that water use does not compromise flows required for fire protection.

**U-6** Locating tracks and other elements such that access to utilities for maintenance and repair can be provided. Where necessary, relocate manholes, pipes, vaults, and other access points.

### 3-16.3.2 Long-Term Mitigation

As stated in Section 3-16-2.4, no long-term impacts to utilities are anticipated. Accordingly, no long-term mitigation measures are required for any of the alternatives.

## 3-16.4 Impact Results with Mitigation

### 3-16.4.1 Construction Period

Construction of any of the alternatives would reflect the results of the consultation mitigation measures stated in Section 3-16.3a. Overall, low level of impacts were identified since it is assumed that most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place, or relocated at the expense of franchise holders. The low level of impacts, coupled with the consultation mitigation measures to address and resolve agency-specific and location-specific issues, would result in less than adverse impacts under NEPA/less than significant impacts under CEQA.

### 3-16.4.2 Long Term

No long-term mitigation measures are required. Long-term impacts for all alternatives would be less than adverse under NEPA and less than significant under CEQA.