

3.12 Population and Housing

3.12.1 Introduction

This section discusses the Project setting in relation to population and housing. It describes existing conditions, the current regulatory setting, and potential impacts from operation and construction of the Build Alternatives including design options and MSF site options.

The population and housing study area encompasses the GSA, which includes low-income, and heavily transit-dependent communities with major activity centers within the Gateway Cities subregion of Los Angeles County. Information in this section is based on the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Community and Neighborhoods Impacts Report (Appendix M).

3.12.2 Regulatory Framework

3.12.2.1 State

3.12.2.1.1 California Relocation Act

The provisions of the California Relocation Act apply in the absence of federal funds and/or involvement if a public entity undertakes a project and consequently must provide relocation assistance and benefits. The California Relocation Act seeks to (1) ensure consistent and fair treatment of owners of real property, (2) encourage and expedite acquisition by agreement to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, and (3) promote confidence in the public land acquisitions process.

Owners of private property have state constitutional guarantees that their property will not be acquired, taken, or damaged for public use unless they first receive an offer of just compensation. A just compensation amount is measured by the “fair market value” (FMV) of the real estate property interests and rights acquired, where FMV is considered to be the:

“Highest price on the date of valuation that would be agreed to by a seller, being willing to sell, but under no particular or urgent necessity for so doing, nor obliged to sell; and a buyer, being ready, willing and able to buy but under no particular necessity for so doing, each dealing with the other with the full knowledge of all the uses and purposes for which the property is reasonably adaptable and available.” (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1263.320a.)

The establishment of FMV of a property is determined by an independent appraisal opinion of value of a property’s worth that is just and equitable on the open market and confirmed by an outside independent review appraisal.

3.12.2.2 Local

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization that oversees regional planning efforts for the six-county region consisting of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Imperial counties. SCAG’s planning efforts focus on strategies to minimize traffic congestion, protect environmental quality, and provide

adequate housing throughout the region. Adopted in September 2020, the SCAG's Connect SoCal 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2020 RTP/SCS) is a long-range visioning plan that builds upon and expands land use and transportation strategies established over several planning cycles to increase mobility options and achieve a more sustainable growth pattern. Connect SoCal projects growth in employment, population, and households at the regional, county, city, town and neighborhood levels. These projections take into account economic and demographic trends, as well as feedback reflecting on-the-ground conditions from SCAG's jurisdictions. The impacts analysis uses these projections to establish the magnitude of impacts related to growth.

The general plan policies of the cities of Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, and Whittier include elements key to population and housing. In general, they all encourage the preservation, rehabilitation and maintenance of existing housing and residential neighborhoods. They also promote the development of new housing to meet the needs of existing and future residents. More information about these general plan policies is available in Appendix M.

3.12.3 Methodology

The impacts analysis is based on demographic information (i.e., population, household, employment) and housing unit data, which was collected at the census tract level from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS), 5-year Estimates, 2015-2019, and at the jurisdictional level from SCAG's 2020 RTP/SCS. A qualitative assessment of impacts on population and housing was conducted based on the Build Alternatives' anticipated effect to existing and projected growth within the GSA and the potential indirect effects on housing. Additionally, the potential for direct effects on housing, including potential displacement due to Project construction, is evaluated within the DSA.

3.12.4 Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Build Alternative would have a significant impact related to population and housing if it would:

Impact PPH-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new housing and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Impact PPH-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

3.12.5 Existing Setting

The GSA is approximately 82 square miles, or about two percent of Los Angeles County geographically. It includes all or portions of 19 cities and areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County. Per the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS, Los Angeles County's population was estimated at 10,407,326 persons and is anticipated to increase by approximately 0.49 percent annually and 12.2 percent by 2045. As shown in **Table 3.12-1**, by 2045, the cities in which the GSA is located are anticipated to grow between 0 to 0.65 percent annually in population and between 0 to 19 percent by 2045. As shown in **Table 3.12-2**, the number of households is anticipated to grow from 0 to 1.16 percent annually in the GSA and 0.75

percent in Los Angeles County. As shown in **Table 3.12-3**, the annual employment growth rate is expected to be between 0 to 0.74 percent in the GSA and 0.45 in Los Angeles County. Thus, the jurisdictions in the GSA have varied rates of population, household and employment growth, and there are areas with growth rates that are both greater and less than the Los Angeles County average. Because population and housing trends occur at the regional level, the GSA is the appropriate scale for this type of analysis.

Table 3.12-1. GSA Population Trends

Geography	2020 Population	2045 Population	Total % Growth (2020 to 2045)	Average Annual Growth per Year
Alhambra	87,218	91,215	4.6%	0.18%
Baldwin Park	76,230	81,691	7.2%	0.29%
Bell	36,498	37,070	1.6%	0.06%
Bell Gardens	42,967	44,337	3.2%	0.13%
Commerce	13,172	13,759	4.5%	0.18%
Downey	113,998	119,207	4.6%	0.18%
El Monte	115,533	137,503	19.0%	0.76%
Industry	440	440	0.0%	0.00%
Los Angeles	4,105,974	4,771,326	16.2%	0.65%
Montebello	64,353	67,808	5.4%	0.21%
Monterey Park	61,983	65,591	5.8%	0.23%
Norwalk	105,766	106,989	1.2%	0.05%
Pico Rivera	63,905	67,387	5.4%	0.22%
Rosemead	55,248	60,257	9.1%	0.36%
San Gabriel	41,217	45,836	11.2%	0.45%
Santa Fe Springs	18,368	20,627	12.3%	0.49%
South El Monte	21,026	22,613	7.5%	0.30%
Vernon	211	211	0.0%	0.00%
Whittier	89,731	98,904	10.2%	0.41%
Los Angeles County	10,407,326	11,673,937	12.2%	0.49%
SCAG Region	19,517,731	22,503,899	15.3%	0.61%

Source: SCAG, 2020 Connect SoCal RTP/SCS.

Table 3.12-2. GSA Household Trends

Geography	2020 Households	2045 Households	Total % Growth (2020 to 2045)	Average Annual Growth per Year
Alhambra	30,304	32,031	5.7%	0.23%
Baldwin Park	17,311	19,234	11.1%	0.44%
Bell	8,994	9,214	2.4%	0.10%
Bell Gardens	9,732	10,216	5.0%	0.20%
Commerce	3,447	3,684	6.9%	0.28%
Downey	32,840	34,072	3.8%	0.15%
El Monte	28,172	36,343	29.0%	1.16%
Industry	64	64	0.0%	0.00%
Los Angeles	1,436,882	1,793,035	24.8%	0.99%
Montebello	19,418	21,066	8.5%	0.34%
Monterey Park	20,370	22,209	9.0%	0.36%
Norwalk	26,812	27,280	1.7%	0.07%
Pico Rivera	16,778	18,475	10.1%	0.40%
Rosemead	14,462	16,508	14.1%	0.57%
San Gabriel	12,992	15,269	17.5%	0.70%
Santa Fe Springs	5,546	6,461	16.5%	0.66%
South El Monte	4,743	5,298	11.7%	0.47%
Vernon	76	76	0.0%	0.00%
Whittier	30,472	33,474	9.9%	0.39%
Los Angeles County	3,471,759	4,119,336	18.7%	0.75%
SCAG Region	6,333,458	7,633,451	20.5%	0.82%

Source: SCAG, 2020 Connect SoCal RTP/SCS.

Table 3.12-3. GSA Employment Trends

Geography	2020 Employment	2045 Employment	Total % Growth (2020 to 2045)	Average Annual Growth per Year
Alhambra	37,861	40,634	7.3%	0.29%
Baldwin Park	25,023	26,531	6.0%	0.24%
Bell	12,516	13,187	5.4%	0.21%
Bell Gardens	9,683	10,289	6.3%	0.25%
Commerce	53,865	56,038	4.0%	0.16%
Downey	43,315	45,822	5.8%	0.23%
El Monte	31,345	37,109	18.4%	0.74%
Industry	80,388	80,388	0.0%	0.00%
Los Angeles	1,890,709	2,135,892	13.0%	0.52%
Montebello	29,684	31,294	5.4%	0.22%
Monterey Park	45,869	48,022	4.7%	0.19%
Norwalk	26,421	28,126	6.5%	0.26%
Pico Rivera	25,294	27,150	7.3%	0.29%
Rosemead	16,673	18,070	8.4%	0.34%
San Gabriel	15,151	16,682	10.1%	0.40%
Santa Fe Springs	57,831	60,979	5.4%	0.22%
South El Monte	16,944	17,724	4.6%	0.18%
Vernon	43,675	44,567	2.0%	0.08%
Whittier	36,393	38,900	6.9%	0.28%
Los Angeles County	4,838,458	5,382,235	10%	0.45%
SCAG Region	8,695,427	10,048,822	13%	0.62%

Source: SCAG, 2020 Connect SoCal RTP/SCS.

As shown in **Table 3.12-4**, there are 119,759 persons living in the census tracts that are within 0.5 miles of the stations along the full alignment (Alternative 1). Of those persons, 49 percent report as a Minority and 51 percent report as White only (non-Hispanic or Latino) according to the 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year population estimates. In addition, 34 percent of the total population is either a student (21 percent) or senior (13 percent) who may be transit-dependent. Around 15 percent of people within 0.5 miles of stations are transit-dependent and below the federal poverty level.

As shown in **Table 3.12-5**, of the total number of housing units, 44.5 percent are owner occupied and 50.8 percent are renter occupied. In comparison, there are a low number of vacant units (4.5 percent). The median home value is estimated at around \$483,274 under 2019 conditions. The median household income is \$59,420 annually and the average household size is 3.6 persons per household.

**Table 3.12-4. General Demographic Characteristics of Census Tracts
within 0.5 Miles of Stations**

	Persons	% of Population
Race		
White	60,584	51%
Black or African American	1,238	1%
American Indian and Alaska Native	1,014	1%
Asian	5,155	4%
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	170	0%
Some other race	49,122	41%
Two or more races	2,476	2%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	106,823	N/A
Transit-Dependent Population Groups		
Students Age 5-19	25,062	21%
Age 65+ Years	14,802	13%
Mode of Transportation to Work		
Car, Truck or Van – Drove Alone	41,143	77%
Car, Truck or Van – Carpool	5,987	11%
Public Transportation for Work	2,650	5%
Work from Home	1,421	3%
Walked	1,327	2%
Taxicab, Motorcycle, Bicycle or other Means	731	1%
Poverty Levels		
Total Population Below Poverty Level	18,205	15%

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates for Census Tracts.

Table 3.12-5. Housing Characteristics of Census Tracts within 0.5 Miles of Stations

	Persons	% of Population
Housing		
Total Housing Units	198,522	NA
Vacant Units	9,054	4.5%
Occupied	189,468	95.4%
Owner-Occupied	88,460	44.5%
Renter-Occupied	101,008	50.8%
Households		
Total Population	119,759	NA
Median Home Value	\$483,274	NA
Median Household Income	\$59,420	NA
Average Household Size of Owner-Occupied	3.67	NA
Average Household Size of Renter-Occupied	3.52	NA

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates for Census Tracts.

3.12.6 Impact Evaluation

3.12.6.1 Impact PPH-1: Unplanned Population Growth

Impact PPH-1: Would a Build Alternative induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?

3.12.6.1.1 Alternative 1 Washington

Operational Impacts

Operation of Alternative 1 would not result in substantial changes to the existing population in the GSA or DSA. Alternative 1 would not include development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce population growth. However, implementation of Alternative 1 could indirectly affect growth and development in the DSA by providing enhanced transit connections that could make station areas more desirable locations for residences and businesses and could encourage growth and economic development in the surrounding communities. There are state and regional planning programs and policies to encourage and incentivize development near transit stations. For example, the County of Los Angeles identifies Transit Orient Districts where specific development standards can be established to encourage in-fill development, pedestrian-friendly, and community-serving uses near transit stops. Metro also supports local jurisdictions in developing and adopting transit-supportive policies and programs to leverage the value of transit investments and increase ridership. Metro does not have land use authority in Los Angeles County. However, the Metro L (Gold) Line extension itself would not on its own dramatically stimulate development or change property values; this would also be influenced by factors related to public policies to encourage development, local zoning requirements, station area demographics, effective service and design, real estate market trends and property availability, and station area/neighborhood design. Rather, the Project would expand transit

service in the region which would allow for increased development around station areas consistent with local policies and zoning requirements and restrictions. Therefore, any development that could result in the vicinity of the proposed stations is anticipated to be consistent with local policies and requirements and local growth projections. Therefore, operation of Alternative 1 is not anticipated to change existing growth and development patterns and any such housing and business development growth would be contingent upon local city zoning regulations and approvals, which would also consider a development's consistency with local general plans and transit oriented development policies. As such, operation of Alternative 1 would not induce unplanned population growth or dramatically stimulate development; the impact would be less than significant.

Design Options

Atlantic/Pomona Station Option

Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not affect population growth differently than the base Alternative 1. No substantial population changes are anticipated in the GSA or DSA as a result of the operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option. Therefore, operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not induce unplanned population growth or dramatically stimulate development; the impact would be less than significant.

Montebello At-Grade Option

Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not affect population growth differently than the base Alternative 1. The at-grade segment of the Montebello At-Grade Option would operate within the median of Washington Boulevard. No substantial population changes are anticipated in the GSA or DSA as a result of operation of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option. Therefore, operation of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not induce unplanned population growth or dramatically stimulate development; the impact would be less than significant.

Construction Impacts

Construction activities under Alternative 1 would not include the development of temporary or permanent housing or other infrastructure that could result in unplanned population growth. While construction activities would result in approximately 630 new temporary employment opportunities at the peak of construction activities, it is not anticipated that there would be any substantial population growth in the GSA or DSA, either directly or indirectly, as a result of temporary construction jobs. The workers would likely come from the existing large labor pool within the greater Los Angeles region and would not result in new workers relocating to the area. As such, construction of Alternative 1 would not induce unplanned population growth; the impact would be less than significant.

Design Options

Atlantic/Pomona Station Option

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not affect population growth differently than the base Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not include the development of housing or infrastructure that could result in unplanned population growth and would result in temporary employment. Thus, construction of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not induce or result in substantial

population growth, either directly or indirectly, within the GSA or DSA; the impact would be less than significant.

Montebello At-Grade Option

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not affect population growth differently than the base Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not include the development of housing or infrastructure that could result in unplanned population growth and would result in temporary employment. Thus, construction of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not induce or result in substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly, within the GSA or DSA; the impact would be less than significant.

3.12.6.1.2 Alternative 2 Atlantic to Citadel IOS

Operational Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Option

Operation of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not result in substantial changes to the existing population in the GSA or DSA as it would not include development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce population growth. Implementation of the Project could indirectly affect growth and development in the DSA by providing enhanced transit connections that would make station areas more desirable locations for residences and businesses. This, in turn, could encourage growth and economic development in the surrounding communities. However, the base Alternative 2 and Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not independently stimulate development or change property values without enabling policy factors like public plans and policies that encourage development and control zoning. Housing and business development growth would be contingent upon local city zoning regulations and approvals which would consider a development's consistency with local general plans and transit oriented development policies. As such, operation of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not induce unplanned population growth or dramatically stimulate development; the impact would be less than significant.

Construction Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Option

Construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not include the development of temporary or permanent housing or other infrastructure that could result in unplanned population growth. While construction activities would result in approximately 340 new temporary employment opportunities at the peak of construction activities, it is not anticipated that there would be any substantial population growth in the GSA or DSA, either directly or indirectly, as a result of temporary construction jobs. The workers would likely come from the existing large labor pool within the greater Los Angeles region and would not result in new workers relocating to the area. As such, construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not induce unplanned population growth; the impact would be less than significant.

3.12.6.1.3 Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS

Operational Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Options

Operation of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would not result in substantial changes to the existing population in the GSA or DSA as it would not include development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce population growth. Implementation of the Project could indirectly affect growth and development in the DSA by providing enhanced transit connections that would make station areas more desirable locations for residences and businesses. This, in turn, could encourage growth and economic development in the surrounding communities. However, the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would not independently stimulate development or change property values without enabling policy factors like public plans and policies that encourage development and control zoning. Housing and business development growth would be contingent upon local city zoning regulations and approval, which would consider consistency with local general plans and transit oriented development policies. As such, operation of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would not induce unplanned population growth or dramatically stimulate development; the impact would be less than significant.

Construction Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Options

Construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or Montebello At-Grade Option would not include the development of temporary or permanent housing or other infrastructure that could result in unplanned population growth. While construction activities would result in approximately 400 new temporary employment opportunities at the peak of construction activities, it is not anticipated that there would be any substantial population growth in the GSA or DSA, either directly or indirectly, as a result of temporary construction jobs. The workers would likely come from the existing large labor pool within the greater Los Angeles region and would not result in new workers relocating to the area. As such, construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or Montebello At-Grade Option would not induce unplanned population growth; the impact would be less than significant.

3.12.6.1.4 Maintenance and Storage Facilities

Operational Impacts

MSF Site Options and Design Option

Operation of the Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would not result in substantial changes to the existing population in the GSA or DSA. The MSF site options would not include development of new housing or businesses that would directly induce population growth. While there would be approximately 350 new permanent employment opportunities associated with operation of the MSF facilities, the increase in employment

needs is not expected to result in population in-migration or relocation because of the large size of the workforce that currently exists in the Los Angeles region as a whole. Given the size of the existing labor pool and the prevalence of cross-county and intercommunity commuting by workers between their places of work and places of residence, it is unlikely that workers would change their place of residence in response to the employment opportunities associated with the MSF site options; subsequently, there would not be an increased need for new housing. As such, operation of the Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would not induce unplanned population growth; the impact would be less than significant.

Construction Impacts

MSF Site Options and Design Option

Construction activities for the Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would not include the development of temporary or permanent housing or other infrastructure that could result in unplanned population growth. It is not anticipated that there would be any substantial population growth in the GSA or DSA, either directly or indirectly, as a result of temporary construction workers and increased job opportunities. The workers would likely come from the existing large labor pool within the greater Los Angeles region and would not result in new workers relocating to the area. As such, construction of the Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would not induce unplanned population growth; the impact would be less than significant.

3.12.6.2 Impact PPH-2: Displacement

Impact PPH-2: Would a Build Alternative displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

3.12.6.2.1 Alternative 1 Washington

Operational Impacts

Operation of Alternative 1 would occur within the transportation ROW and at the new stations. Under Alternative 1, no acquisition of residential structures would occur; therefore, no people or housing would be displaced. Therefore, operation of Alternative 1 would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impact would occur.

Design Options

Atlantic/Pomona Station Option

Operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not result in substantial displacement of people or housing as no residential structures would be acquired; no impact would occur.

Montebello At-Grade Option

Operation of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not result in substantial displacement of people or housing as no residential structures would be acquired; no impact would occur.

Construction Impacts

While construction of Alternative 1 would result in acquisition of non-residential properties, no residential parcels would be acquired. Therefore, there would be no displacement of any people or housing and there would be no need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

Design Options

Atlantic/Pomona Station Option

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not displace people or housing as no residential parcels would be acquired. Therefore, there would be no need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

Montebello At-Grade Option

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would not displace people or housing as no residential parcels would be acquired. Therefore, there would be no need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

3.12.6.2.2 Alternative 2 Atlantic to Citadel IOS

Operational Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Option

Operation of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would occur within the transportation ROW and at the new stations. No acquisition of residential structures would occur and no people or housing would be displaced. Therefore, operation of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

Construction Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Option

While construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would result in acquisition of non-residential properties, no residential parcels would be acquired. Therefore, construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing and there would be no need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

3.12.6.2.3 Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS

Operational Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Options

Operation of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or Montebello At-Grade Option would occur within the transportation ROW and at the new stations. No acquisition of residential structures would occur, and no people or housing would be displaced. Therefore, operation of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or Montebello At-Grade Option would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

Construction Impacts

Base Alternative and Design Options

While construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or Montebello At-Grade Option would result in acquisition of non-residential properties, no residential parcels would be acquired. Therefore, there would be no displacement of any people or housing and there would be no need for replacement housing. Therefore, construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing and there would be no need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

3.12.6.2.4 Maintenance and Storage Facilities

Operational Impacts

MSF Site Options and Design Option

The Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would operate entirely within an industrial area and its operations would not displace any people or housing units. Therefore, operation of the MSF site options would not result in a need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

Construction Impacts

MSF Site Options and Design Option

The Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would be constructed within an industrial area and would not include the acquisition of residential structures or displacement of any people. Therefore, construction of the MSF site options would not result in a need for replacement housing. No impact would occur.

3.12.7 Project Measures and Mitigation Measures

As identified in **Section 3.12.6**, the Build Alternatives and Build Alternatives with the design option(s) would have less than significant impacts on population and housing under Impact PPH-1 (Unplanned Population Growth) and no impact on population and housing under Impact PPH-2 (Displacement). The MSF site options would have less than significant impacts under Impact PPH-1 (Unplanned Population Growth) and no impact under PPH-2 (Displacement). No project measures or mitigation measures would be required for operation or construction. **Table 3.12-6** identifies the combined impact of the base alternatives with the associated MSF site option(s), and the alternatives with one or both design options (as applicable) with the associated MSF site option(s).

3.12.8 Significance After Mitigation

As identified in **Table 3.12-6**, **no mitigation is required** for the Build Alternatives and Build Alternatives with the design option(s). Less than significant impacts would remain under Impact PPH-1 and no impact would remain under Impact PPH-2.

Table 3.12-6. Summary of Mitigation Measures and Impacts After Mitigation

CEQA Impact Topic		Alternative 1: Washington Boulevard								Alternative 2: Commerce/Citadel IOS		Alternative 3: Washington/Greenwood IOS							
		Base Alternative 1 ¹		Alternative 1 + Atlantic/Pomona Station Option		Alternative 1 + Montebello At-Grade Option		Alternative 1 + Atlantic/Pomona Station Option + Montebello At-Grade Option		Base Alternative 2 ²	Alternative 2 + Atlantic/Pomona Station Option	Base Alternative 3 ³		Alternative 3 + Atlantic/Pomona Station Option		Alternative 3 + Montebello At-Grade Option		Alternative 3 + Atlantic/Pomona Station Option + Montebello At-Grade Option	
		Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF	Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF	Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF At-Grade Option	Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF At-Grade Option	Commerce MSF		Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF	Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF	Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF At-Grade Option	Commerce MSF	Montebello MSF At-Grade Option
Impact PPH-1: Unplanned Population Growth	Applicable Mitigation	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
	Impacts After Mitigation	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
PPH-2 Displacement	Applicable Mitigation	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
	Impacts After Mitigation	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI

Source: CDM Smith/AECOM JV, 2022.

Notes:

The Base Alternatives are shaded in light yellow. Design options are not shaded.

¹ The Base Alternative 1 includes the Atlantic station (reconfigured/relocated) and aerial Greenwood station.

² The Base Alternative 2 includes the Atlantic station (reconfigured/relocated).

³ The Base Alternative 3 includes the Atlantic station (reconfigured/relocated) and aerial Greenwood station.

Key:

NI = No Impact

LTS = Less Than Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

This page intentionally left blank.