3. Corrections and Additions

3.1 Introduction

As provided in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(d), responses to comments may take the form of a revision to the draft EIR or may be a separate section in the final EIR. Where the response to comments makes important changes in the information contained in the text of the draft EIR, the lead agency should either revise the text in the body of the EIR or include marginal notes showing that the information is revised. Consistent with this guidance, this chapter provides textual changes as a result of clarifications to, and comments received on, the Recirculated Draft EIR for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2. In addition, it includes minor revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR resulting from minor corrections or updates to the information presented in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

The revisions identified with this chapter are hereby made to the text of the Recirculated Draft EIR. Changes in the text are signified by strikeouts where text is removed and shown with italics and underline where text is added. These changes do not add significant new information to the EIR that would require recirculation of the Recirculated Draft EIR under Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. For example, they do not disclose or suggest new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts of the Project, or a new feasible mitigation measure or alternative considerably different than those analyzed in the Recirculated Draft EIR that would clearly lessen the Project's significant effects and that the Project proponent (Metro) declines to adopt. Instead, the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications to the Recirculated Draft EIR.

As described in **Section 1.5.2**, pursuant to the Metro Board decision on December 1, 2022, the Final EIR advances the evaluation of the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, the Montebello At-Grade Option and the Montebello MSF
- Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, the Montebello At-Grade Option, and the Montebello MSF (the LPA)

Although the Metro Board did not vote to advance evaluation of Alternative 2 in the Final EIR, Chapter 3, Corrections and Additions, identifies corrections and additions to all alternatives, design options, and MSF site options evaluated in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

3.2 Corrections and Additions to the Recirculated Draft EIR – Main Document

3.2.1 Metro E Line Revisions

All references to the Metro L (Gold) Line or Metro Gold Line in the Draft EIR and Appendices, including references in figures and appendix cover pages, are hereby revised to the Metro E Line. This change is consistent with a systemwide name change implemented by Metro due to the opening of the Regional Connector. The opening and renaming of the light rail lines was done after the release of the Recirculated Draft EIR. This is a name change only and it does not have any effect on the factual information, impact evaluation, or impact determination presented in the Recirculated Draft EIR. As such, this Chapter does not identify the specific pages where this change occurs and instead identifies it herein globally.

3.2.2 Executive Summary

Page ES-13. **Section ES.4** Environmental Analysis, **Table ES-2** is hereby revised as follows to correct an error in the table that mislabeled the No Project Alternative impact for Land Use; the revised text is consistent with, and does not alter, the evaluation of the No Project Alternative set forth in Chapter 5, Comparison of Alternatives, of the Recirculated Draft EIR:

Table ES-2 Summary of Impacts by Environmental Resource

Alternative		Aesthetics	Air Quality	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Energy Resources	Geology and Soils	Green House Gas Emissions	Hazards and Haz-Materials	Hydrology and Water Quality	Land Use
No Project Alternative		NI	SU	NI	NI	NI	NI	SU	NI	LTS	~~NI~~ *SU*
Alt 1[1,2]	Commerce MSF	LTS	LTS	LTSM	SU	LTS	SU	LTS	LTSM	LTSM	LTS
	Montebello MSF	LTS	LTS	LTSM	LTSM	LTS	SU	LTS	LTSM	LTSM	LTS

Pages ES-14 through ES-35, Section ES.4 Environmental Analysis, Table ES-3 Summary of Impact Evaluation of the Recirculated Draft EIR, is hereby revised as follows to be consistent with modifications to mitigation measure titles identified in **Sections 3.2.5**, **3.2.9**, and 3.2.12 below, and to be consistent with modifications to the Impact BIO-2 impact determination for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 as identified in **Section 3.2.5** below.

Table ES-3. Summary of Impact Evaluation of Recirculated Draft EIR

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
Biological Resources	BIO-1	Protected Species	Alt 1:	Potentially Significant	• MM BIO-1 (Bat Emergence Surveys) • MM BIO-2 (Bat Nesting Survey) • MM BIO-3 (Bat Exclusion Plan and Measures) • MM BIO-4 (Bird Nesting Survey)	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	Potentially Significant	• MM BIO-4 (Bird Nesting Survey)	Less Than Significant
			Alt 3:	Potentially Significant	• MM BIO-4 (Bird Nesting Survey)	Less Than Significant
	BIO-2	Riparian Habitat/ Sensitive Natural Communities	Alt 1:	Potentially Significant	• MM BIO-5 (*Invasive Plant and Infectious Tree Disease Mitigation Plan* ~~Equipment Cleaning to reduce spread of Invasive Species~~) • MM BIO-6 (Tire Cleaning to reduce spread of Invasive Species)	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	*Less than Significant* ~~Potentially Significant~~	*None* ~~• MM BIO-5 (Equipment Cleaning to reduce spread of Invasive Species)~~ ~~• MM BIO-6 (Tire Cleaning to reduce spread of Invasive Species)~~	Less Than Significant
			Alt 3:	*Less than Significant* ~~Potentially Significant~~	*None* ~~• MM BIO-5 (Equipment Cleaning to reduce spread of Invasive Species)~~ ~~• MM BIO-6 (Tire Cleaning to reduce spread of Invasive Species)~~	Less Than Significant
	BIO-3	Movement of Fish and Wildlife Species	Alt 1:	Less than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	No Impact	None	No Impact
			Alt 3:	No Impact	None	No Impact
	BIO-4	Policies/ Ordinances	Alt 1:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
			Alt 3:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ-1	Transport, Storage, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	Alt 1:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 3:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
	HAZ-2	Release of Hazardous Materials	Alt 1:	Potentially Significant	• MM HAZ-1 (Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~) • MM HAZ-2 (Soil and Groundwater Management Plan) • MM HAZ-3 (Contractor Specifications for Hazardous Materials) • MM HAZ-4 (*Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~) • MM HAZ-5 (Hazardous Building Survey and Abatement)	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	Potentially Significant	• MM HAZ-1 (Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~) • MM HAZ-2 (Soil and Groundwater Management Plan) • MM HAZ-3 (Contractor Specifications for Hazardous Materials) • MM HAZ-4 (*Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~) • MM HAZ-5 (Hazardous Building Survey and Abatement)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
			Alt 3:	Potentially Significant	• MM HAZ-1 (Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~) • MM HAZ-2 (Soil and Groundwater Management Plan) • MM HAZ-3 (Contractor Specifications for Hazardous Materials) • MM HAZ-4 (*Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~) • MM HAZ-5 (Hazardous Building Survey and Abatement)	Less Than Significant
	HAZ-3	Hazardous Materials Within One-Quarter Mile of a School	Alt 1:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 3:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
	HAZ-4	Hazardous Materials Sites (Government Code Section 65962.5)	Alt 1:	Potentially Significant	• MM HAZ-1 (Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~) • MM HAZ-2 (Soil and Groundwater Management Plan) • MM HAZ-3 (Contractor Specifications for Hazardous Materials) • MM HAZ-4 (*Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~) • MM HAZ-5 (Hazardous Building Survey and Abatement)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
			Alt 2:	Potentially Significant	• MM HAZ-1 (Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~) • MM HAZ-2 (Soil and Groundwater Management Plan) • MM HAZ-3 (Contractor Specifications for Hazardous Materials) • MM HAZ-4 (*Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~) • MM HAZ-5 (Hazardous Building Survey and Abatement)	Less Than Significant
	HAZ-4	Hazardous Materials Sites (Government Code Section 65962.5)	Alt 3:	Potentially Significant	• MM HAZ-1 (Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~) • MM HAZ-2 (Soil and Groundwater Management Plan) • MM HAZ-3 (Contractor Specifications for Hazardous Materials) • MM HAZ-4 (*Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~) • MM HAZ-5 (Hazardous Building Survey and Abatement)	Less Than Significant
	HAZ-5	Airport Land Use Plans	Alt 1:	No Impact	None	No Impact
			Alt 2:	No Impact	None	No Impact
			Alt 3:	No Impact	None	No Impact
	HAZ-6	Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan	Alt 1:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 2:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
			Alt 3:	Less Than Significant	None	Less Than Significant
	HAZ-7	Wildland Hazards	Alt 1:	No Impact	None	No Impact
			Alt 2:	No Impact	None	No Impact
			Alt 3:	No Impact	None	No Impact

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
Noise and Vibration	NOI-1	Ambient Noise	Alt 1:	Potentially Significant	• MM NOI-1 (Construction Noise Plan and Noise Monitoring Plan) • MM NOI-2 (Cast-in-Drilled-Hole Construction Methodology) • MM NOI-3 (Noise Barriers) • MM NOI-4 (Construction Staging Area) • MM NOI-5 (Haul Routes) • MM NOI-6 (Best Available Control Technologies) • MM NOI-7 (*Replaced by MM NOI-1*~~Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-8 (Public Notification of Construction Operations and Schedules) • MM NOI-9 (Tunneling Boring Machine *Spoil* ~~Muck~~ Removal Equipment) • MM NOI-10 (*Construction Staging* ~~Tunneling Boring Machine Muck Removal Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-11 (Placement of Tunnel Vent Fans)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
	NOI-1	Ambient Noise	Alt 2:	Potentially Significant	• MM NOI-1 (Construction Noise Plan and Noise Monitoring Plan) • MM NOI-2 (Cast-in-Drilled-Hole Construction Methodology) • MM NOI-3 (Noise Barriers) • MM NOI-4 (Construction Staging Area) • MM NOI-5 (Haul Routes) • MM NOI-6 (Best Available Control Technologies) • MM NOI-7 (*Replaced by MM NOI-1*~~Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-8 (Public Notification of Construction Operations and Schedules) • MM NOI-9 (Tunneling Boring Machine *Spoil*~~Muck~~ Removal Equipment) • MM NOI-10 (*Construction Staging*~~Tunneling Boring Machine Muck Removal Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-11 (Placement of Tunnel Vent Fans)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
	NOI-1	Ambient Noise	Alt 3:	Potentially Significant	• MM NOI-1 (Construction Noise Plan and Noise Monitoring Plan) • MM NOI-2 (Cast-in-Drilled-Hole Construction Methodology) • MM NOI-3 (Noise Barriers) • MM NOI-4 (Construction Staging Area) • MM NOI-5 (Haul Routes) • MM NOI-6 (Best Available Control Technologies) • MM NOI-7 (*Replaced by MM NOI-1*~~Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-8 (Public Notification of Construction Operations and Schedules) • MM NOI-9 (Tunneling Boring Machine *Spoil*~~Muck~~ Removal Equipment) • MM NOI-10 (*Construction Staging*~~Tunneling Boring Machine Muck Removal Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-11 (Placement of Tunnel Vent Fans)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
	NOI-2	Ground Borne Vibration	Alt 1:	Potentially Significant	• MM NOI-2 (Cast-in-Drilled-Hole Construction Methodology) • MM NOI-4 (Construction Staging Area) • MM NOI-5 (Haul Routes) • MM NOI-7 (*Replaced by MM NOI-1*~~Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-8 (Public Notification of Construction Operations and Schedules) • MM NOI-9 (Tunneling Boring Machine *Spoil*~~Muck~~ Removal Equipment) • MM NOI-12 (High Resilience Track Support Systems) • MM NOI-13 (Gapless Switches) • MM NOI-14 (Vibration Pre-Construction Survey) • MM NOI-15 (Construction Vibration Plan and Vibration Monitoring Plan)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
	NOI-2	Ground Borne Vibration	Alt 2:	Potentially Significant	• MM NOI-2 (Cast-in-Drilled-Hole Construction Methodology) • MM NOI-4 (Construction Staging Area) • MM NOI-5 (Haul Routes) • MM NOI-7 (*Replaced by MM NOI-1*~~Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-8 (Public Notification of Construction Operations and Schedules) • MM NOI-9 (Tunneling Boring Machine *Spoil* ~~Muck~~ Removal Equipment) • MM NOI-12 (High Resilience Track Support Systems) • MM NOI-13 (Gapless Switches) • MM NOI-14 (Vibration Pre-Construction Survey) • MM NOI-15 (Construction Vibration Plan and Vibration Monitoring Plan)	Less Than Significant

Environmental Topic	Impact Evaluated		Impact Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures Needed	Impacts After Mitigation
	NOI-2	Ground Borne Vibration	Alt 3:	Potentially Significant	• MM NOI-2 (Cast-in-Drilled-Hole Construction Methodology) • MM NOI-4 (Construction Staging Area) • MM NOI-5 (Haul Routes) • MM NOI-7 (*Replaced by MM NOI-1*~~Construction Working Hours~~) • MM NOI-8 (Public Notification of Construction Operations and Schedules) • MM NOI-9 (Tunneling Boring Machine *Spoil*~~Muck~~ Removal Equipment) • MM NOI-12 (High Resilience Track Support Systems) • MM NOI-13 (Gapless Switches) • MM NOI-14 (Vibration Pre-Construction Survey) • MM NOI-15 (Construction Vibration Plan and Vibration Monitoring Plan)	Less Than Significant

3.2.3 Section 2 Project Description

Pages 2-15, 2-25, and 2-28. **Section 2.5.1.2**, **Section 2.5.2.2**, and **Section 2.5.3.2**, Proposed Stations, are hereby revised as follows for clarification:

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured)** – The existing Atlantic Station would be relocated and reconfigured to an underground center platform station located beneath Atlantic Boulevard south of Beverly Boulevard in East Los Angeles. The existing parking structure located north of the 3rd Street and Atlantic Boulevard intersection would continue to serve this station. Access to the station would be via an entrance located west of Atlantic Boulevard between Beverly Boulevard and 4th Street, and would include a set of stairs, escalators, and elevators. *In coordination with Metro Art, efforts would be made, as feasible, to relocate the artwork from the existing Atlantic Station to the new Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured) Station.*

Pages 2-16, 2-26, and 2-29. **Section 2.5.1.3**, **Section 2.5.2.3**, and **Section 2.5.3.3**, Design Options, are hereby revised as follows for clarification:

- **Atlantic/Pomona Station Option** – The Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would relocate the existing Atlantic Station to a shallow open air underground station with two side platforms and a canopy. As shown in Figure 2.14, this station design option would be located beneath the existing triangular parcel bounded by Atlantic Boulevard, Pomona Boulevard, and Beverly Boulevard. The excavation depth of the station invert would be approximately 20 to 25 feet from the existing ground elevation. This option would also impact the guideway alignment and location of the TBM extraction pit. As shown in Figure 2.14, the underground guideway would be located east of Atlantic Boulevard and require full property acquisitions at its footprint between Beverly Boulevard and 4th Street. The alignment would connect with the base Alternative 2 alignment just north of the proposed Atlantic/Whittier station. The TBM extraction pit would be east of Atlantic Boulevard between Repetto Street and 4th Street. Limits for the excavation would occur between the TBM extraction pit and the intersection of Pomona Boulevard and Beverly Boulevard. *In coordination with Metro Art, efforts would be made, as feasible, to relocate the artwork from the existing Atlantic Station to the new Atlantic/Pomona Station Option.*

Pages 2-37, following the second paragraph of Section 2.5.6 is hereby revised as follows for information:

Section 2.5.7 Design Refinements

Project refinements to the overall project design and performance have been identified following publication of the Recirculated Draft EIR. These refinements consist of (1) an optional Guideway Refinement for the transition from the aerial configuration to the at-grade configuration; and (2) Crossover Refinements consisting of three crossover locations that were not identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR (and one optional crossover. Apart from one new crossover location that is applicable to Alternative 1 only, the Guideway Refinement and Crossover Refinements are applicable to both Alternative 1 and Alternative 3. The Crossover Refinements are applicable to Alternatives 1 and 3 with the Montebello At-Grade Option or the Guideway Design Refinement. Chapter 2, Design Refinements, of the Final EIR provides a description of the Guideway Refinement and the Crossover Refinements, identifies the relationship of these refinements to the Recirculated Draft EIR, and presents an evaluation of environmental impacts of Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 with the

refinements. The analysis presented in Chapter 2 of the Final EIR should be read in conjunction with the impact analysis contained in Chapter 3 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, and the associated modifications thereto, identified in Chapter 3 of the Final EIR.

Page 2-44. **Section 2.7**, Permits and Approvals. **Table 2-5** is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received by Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts:

Table 2-5. Required Agency/Jurisdiction Permits

Agency/Jurisdiction	Permits
State Water Resources Control Board	NPDES Dewatering permit, Los Angeles County MS4 NPDES Package, Industrial General Permit; Construction General Permit and SWPPP
Regional Water Quality Control Boards	Section 401
SCAQMD	Consultation to identify best practices for construction emissions, Clean Air Act Title V permit (if required)
BNSF Railroad	Encroachment permits
UPRR	Encroachment permits
Los Angeles County Flood Control District	Permits
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works	Permits
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts	*Permits*
County of Los Angeles and cities of Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, and Whittier	Permits and/or discretionary actions required

Key:
BNSF = Burlington Northern Santa Fe
NPDES= National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
SWPPP = Stormwater pollution prevention plan
MS4 = Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
SCAQMD = Southern Coast Air Quality Management District
UPRR = Union Pacific Railroad

3.2.4 Section 3.1 Aesthetics

Page 3.1-10. The second paragraph of **Section 3.1.5.4.2**, Landscape Unit 2 – Smithway Street, Subsection Commerce, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments:

Ferguson Boulevard is a four-lane collector roadway that runs east to west with two lanes of traffic in both directions and a sidewalk on the south side of the roadway *to the west of Gerhart Avenue*.

Page 3.1-10. The third paragraph of **Section 3.1.5.4.2**, Landscape Unit 2 – Smithway Street, Subsection Commerce, is hereby revised as follows:

Smithway Street is a two-lane arterial roadway that runs east-west with one lane of traffic in each direction. The roadway ~~is not typically busy and~~functions as an access road for the north entrance of the Citadel Outlets' parking facilities and for the surrounding industrial buildings.

Page 3.1-44. Section 3.1.6.3.1 Alternative 1 Washington Alternative, Subsection Operational Impacts. Figure 3.1.34, Visual Simulation: "Washington Boulevard at Greenwood Avenue (At-Grade Option) (Looking east)" is hereby revised as follows to include a new Existing and Conceptual image to

show the station consistent with the current Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy. The caption does not need to be updated.

3.2.5 Section 3.3 Biological Resources

Page 3.3-2. The beginning of **Section 3.3.2.3**, Local, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> *In October 2022, Metro adopted the LA Metro Tree Policy to help preserve and grow Los Angeles County's urban tree canopy. The policy clarifies and standardizes Metro's practices for protecting the urban tree canopy throughout its transit construction program. It also establishes the agency's commitment to a sustainable tree replacement strategy when tree removal is deemed unavoidable to build Metro projects. In addition to the LA Metro Tree Policy,* Los Angeles County and the cities within the Build Alternative BRSAs have local regulations pertaining to the protection of native or locally important trees and/or street trees in public areas.

Page 3.3-16. The fourth paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Maintenance of LRT facilities is not likely to entail removal of vegetation or of cliff swallow nesting habitat at the bridges but could involve tree trimming along the alignment. Any tree trimming along Alternative 1 during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, which requires nesting bird surveys and avoidance of active nests during the bird nesting season as discussed in **Section 3.3.7**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 3.3-16. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming along Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized above and discussed in **Section 3.3.7**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 3.3-17. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming along Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized above and discussed in **Section 3.3.7**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 3.3-19. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.1.2** Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Designs Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> As discussed in **Section 3.3.5.5**, migratory birds could nest in street trees. Any tree trimming along the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 3.3.6.1** and discussed in **Section 3.3.7**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 3.3-20. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Designs Options, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> As discussed in **Section 3.3.5.5**, migratory birds could nest in street trees. Any tree trimming along the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 3.3.6.1** and discussed in **Section 3.3.7**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of the base Alternative 3

or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 3.3-21. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.1.4**, Maintenance and Storage Facilities, Subsection Operational Impacts, MSF Site Options and Designs Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

The proposed MSF site options would be in a highly urbanized environment that already experiences noise and vibration levels that likely discourage birds from nesting close to the proposed location. However, there are a few street trees within and along the MSF site options. Any tree trimming within the MSF site options during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. I~~*i*mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 3.3.6.1** and discussed in **Section 3.3.7**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of MSF site options *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 3.3-22 – 3.3-23. The second paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

Many species of invasive plants were observed in the *rivers and spreading grounds* ~~areas~~ where construction would occur. ~~Along the underground, at-grade, and aerial portions of the alignment~~*In these areas*, construction equipment would likely be operated within areas of exposed dirt. The possible introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from use of equipment, which could spread invasive plant seeds from one area of exposed soil to another, would result in a potentially significant impact on ~~native~~ vegetation communities and habitat *within the rivers and spreading grounds*. *Further, construction within vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) in the rivers and spreading grounds could spread tree pathogens from one tree to another, resulting in a potentially significant impact.* Implementation of MM BIO-5, which requires the contractor to *prepare an invasive plant and infectious tree disease mitigation plan for work within the rivers and spreading grounds and* ~~clean construction vehicles with compressed air or water within a designated containment area and~~ MM BIO-6, which requires the contractor to wash soil and plant material off all equipment tires and tread*s* before moving to areas of exposed soils *in accordance with the plan*, as identified in **Section 3.3.7**, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds *and tree pathogens within the rivers and spreading grounds* and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.

Page 3.3-23. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operation Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

As with the base Alternative 1, there would be a potentially significant impact from the possible introduction or spread of invasive plants *and tree pathogens* from use of construction equipment ~~in areas of exposed soil~~ *within the rivers and spreading grounds*. Implementation of MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6, as summarized above and identified in **Section 3.3.7**, would reduce

the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.

Page 3.3-23. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows based on based on further Project analysis:

As with the base Alternative 1, there would be a potentially significant impact from the possible introduction or spread of invasive plants *and tree pathogens* from use of construction equipment ~~in areas of exposed soil~~ *within the rivers and spreading grounds*. Implementation of MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6, as summarized above and identified in **Section 3.3.7**, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.

Page 3.3-24. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.2.2** Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 2 are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, construction of Alternative 2 would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur underground or in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 2 would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~The possible introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Implementation of MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6, as summarized in Section 3.3.6.2.1 and identified in Section 3.3.7, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.~~

Page 3.3-24. The last paragraph of **Section 3.3.6.2.3** Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 3 are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, Alternative 3 would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 3 would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~The possible introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Implementation of MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6, as summarized in Section 3.3.6.2.1 and identified in Section 3.3.7, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.~~

Page 3.3-28. The beginning of **Section 3.3.6.4.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Trees along the Alternative 1 alignment and within proposed stations would be protected by *the new LA Metro Tree Policy and* local tree protection policies discussed in **Section 3.3.2.3** and Appendix D. Trees within the Alternative 1 alignment and station footprints are discussed in **Sections 3.3.5.5**. Any maintenance that requires tree trimming would comply with *the LA Tree Policy. In addition, Metro would collaborate with the local jurisdictions along the alignment with respect to* local policies and municipal codes protecting both native trees and street trees. Thus, Alternative 1 would not conflict with tree protection policies or other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; no impact would occur.

Page 3.3-29. **Section 3.3.6.4.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

As project design progresses and construction plans are finalized, it may be possible to minimize the number of affected trees by avoidance or fencing. *Moreover, in accordance with the LA Metro Tree Policy, Metro would protect large trees that would remain in place from immediate damage during construction and from delayed damage due to construction activities, such as loss of root area or compaction of the soil by equipment. In addition, p*Prior to construction, local policies and municipal codes regarding protection of both native trees and street trees, as described in Appendix D, would be considered to ensure compliance requirements are met.

Page 3.3-29. **Section 3.3.6.4.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and in coordination with* local tree protection policies.

Pages 3.3-29 – 3.3-30. **Section 3.3.6.4.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and in coordination with* local tree protection policies.

Page 3.3-30. **Section 3.3.6.4.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Any maintenance of LRT facilities that entails tree trimming would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees, as outlined in **Section 3.3.2**.

Page 3.3-30. **Section 3.3.6.4.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option may require tree removal or trimming. It is not expected that all the trees along the

alignment or within station footprints would be affected by construction. This work would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees. *The LA Metro Tree Policy contains measures to protect trees designated for retention and tree replacement requirements for trees to be removed. In addition, local t*~~T~~ree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 3.3-30. **Section 3.3.6.4.3**, Operational Impacts, Base Alternatives and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Any maintenance of LRT facilities that entails tree trimming would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees.

Page 3.3-31. **Section 3.3.6.4.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option may require tree removal or trimming. It is not expected that all the trees along the alignment or within station footprints would be affected by construction. This work would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees.

Page 3.3-31. **Section 3.3.6.4.4**, Maintenance and Storage Facilities, Subsection Operational Impacts, MSF Site Options and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Any maintenance of the Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option that entails tree trimming would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with local* policies and municipal codes protecting trees, as outlined in **Section 3.3.2.3**.

Page 3.3-31. **Section 3.3.6.4.4**, Maintenance and Storage Facilities, Subsection Construction Impacts, MSF Site Options and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of the Commerce MSF site option, the Montebello MSF site option, or the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option may require tree removal or trimming. This work would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and would be coordinated with local* policies and codes protecting trees. *Local t*~~T~~ree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 3.3-32. MM BIO-1 in **Section 3.3.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW):

MM BIO-1: Up to a year prior to demolition work occurring at bridges, and in coordination with CDFW, bat emergence surveys and nighttime surveys shall be conducted at each affected bridge site to confirm whether bats are roosting on or within 100 feet of any of the bridges affected by construction activities. *Surveys shall include identification of any trees within 100 feet of the bridges affected by construction activities that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat.* Surveys shall be scheduled by Metro or the contractor. Surveys shall be conducted using ultrasonic detectors and night vision technology in order to capture species and emergence locations. Surveys shall include species classification of detected bat calls to help identify bat species roosting within 100 feet of the construction area. If it is determined that bat species are roosting on or within 100 feet of the bridges affected by construction activities, MM BIO-3 shall be implemented.

Page 3.3-32. MM BIO-2 in **Section 3.3.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from CDFW:

MM BIO-2: Prior to demolition work occurring at bridges and outside of the bird nesting season for cliff swallows (February 15 to ~~August 31~~*September 15*), inactive swallow nests on or within 100 feet of the affected bridges shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist to determine whether they are occupied by roosting bats. *Nests shall be removed prior to overwintering use by bats and in a manner that ensures they do not fall to the ground or are otherwise destroyed unless absence of bats is confirmed through inspection by a qualified bat biologist.* ~~If the nests are unoccupied, they shall be removed under the direction of a qualified biologist. Any nests occupied by bats shall be removed under supervision of a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW during nighttime hours following the evening emergence of occupying bats.~~

Page 3.3-32 – Page 3.3-33. MM BIO-3 in **Section 3.3.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from CDFW:

MM BIO-3: If it is determined that bat species are roosting on or within 100 feet of the affected bridges, consultation with CDFW shall be conducted prior to initiating construction, a CDFW-approved bat exclusion plan shall be developed, and the following measures shall be implemented along with any additional measures required by CDFW to avoid impacts on bat species:

- At least six months prior to construction at the affected bridges, alternative roosting sites shall be researched and surveyed by a qualified biologist, and alternative bat habitat (e.g., concrete Oregon wedge enclosure, bat houses, etc.) shall be developed and installed, in coordination with CDFW, at nearby locations to provide alternative habitat for bats displaced by project construction.

- Bat exclusion measures shall be explored and implemented on the bridges and within 100 feet of the affected bridges *including tree roosts*, or as determined by a qualified bat biologist, to the maximum extent feasible to reduce the potential for bat presence during construction. Bat exclusionary measures could include expandable foam placed in expansion joints and crevices, and sheet plastic fitted with one-way exits

in areas where bats are potentially roosting. Bat exclusion shall only be installed during the fall and winter seasons, generally after September 30, to avoid impacts on maternal and juvenile bats. No less than six weeks prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall survey the area to confirm that exclusionary measures have been successful and that no bats remain in the exclusion area. If any bats remain within the exclusion area, appropriate measures shall be developed and implemented, in coordination with CDFW prior to construction at the affected bridges, to prevent impacts on bats.

Page 3.3-33. MM BIO-4 in **Section 3.3.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from CDFW and to improve clarity:

MM BIO-4: Prior to the implementation of construction activities (e.g., demolition of structures, excavation, grading, construction of access roads) that would result in removal of or disturbances to vegetation and structures providing bird nesting habitat, ~~and~~ prior to pile driving near active bird nests, and *prior to tree trimming during the maintenance period*~~maintenance activities (e.g., tree trimming) during the bird nesting season, which generally runs from January 1 through September 1~~, the following shall occur:

- *If construction is scheduled to occur during the bird nesting season (generally February 15 through September 15, and as early as January 1 for some raptors), vegetation that will be impacted by the Project shall be removed in advance of the construction activities and outside the nesting season, if feasible, to avoid take of birds, raptors, or their eggs. If this is not feasible, prior to the implementation of construction activities,* ~~One biological~~ *one nesting bird* survey shall be conducted 72 hours prior to construction or maintenance that shall remove or disturb suitable nesting habitat during the breeding season. The survey shall be performed by a biologist with experience conducting breeding bird surveys. The biologist shall prepare a survey report within 24 hours of conducting the survey, documenting the presence or absence of any active nest of a migratory bird. If an active nest is located, an appropriate no-work buffer shall be established ~~by CDFW~~ and vegetation removal within the buffer shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged (minimum of six weeks after egg-laying) and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Buffers may be as large as 300 feet for migratory bird nests and 500 feet for raptor nests.

The following shall occur if Alternative 1 is selected and approved:

- *Swallow Nesting and Exclusion. Demolition work occurring at the Washington Boulevard bridges shall either occur outside of the swallow nesting period (February 15 through September 15) or Metro shall exclude swallows from areas along the bridges where demolition activities would cause nest damage or abandonment (i.e., on any part of the bridges) using netting. The netting shall remain in place until August 1 or until construction activities at the site are complete. The netting shall be anchored such that swallows cannot attach their nests to the structure through gaps in the net. If*

swallows begin building nests on the structure after net installation, the mud placed by the swallows shall be removed and the net's integrity repaired.

- *Swallow Nesting Inspection. If demolition of the Washington Boulevard bridges occurs between February 15 through September 15, the portion of the bridges where construction activities would occur shall be subject to weekly inspection for nesting activity in that time period. If cliff swallows begin colonizing the bridge(s) prior to beginning bridge work, all nest precursors (e.g., mud placed by swallows for construction of nests) shall be washed down at least once daily until swallows cease trying to construct nests. This activity shall not result in harm or death to adult swallows. This weekly inspection and washing activity shall occur until April 1; after that period, no washing activity shall occur to prevent harm or death to eggs or nestlings.*

- *Swallow Nest Removal. Swallow nests on the Washington Boulevard bridges shall be removed in the fall after nesting season (February 15 to September 15), consistent with MM BIO-2, to further discourage swallows from nesting on the bridges during construction activities occurring within 100 feet of the bridges and only after nests are confirmed to be inactive.*

Page 3.3-33. MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6 in **Section 3.3.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from CDFW based on further Project analysis:

MM BIO-5: *Prior to construction, the Contractor shall prepare an Invasive Plant and Infectious Tree Disease Mitigation Plan t*~~T~~o minimize the introduction *or migration* of invasive plant species into *other* construction areas~~.~~ *The plan shall be implemented where construction activities cross the rivers and spreading grounds and shall include, at a minimum, the following*:

- *C*~~c~~*onstruction* vehicles and equipment shall be cleaned *of pathogens and/or invasive or diseased plants and/or seeds* with compressed water or air~~within a designated containment area to remove pathogens, invasive plant seeds, or plant parts and dispose of them in an appropriate disposal facility.~~*, or similar compression device, before working in an area of exposed soil and before leaving the area of exposed soil during the course of construction.*

- *Cleaning of equipment shall occur within a designated containment area to avoid the spread of pathogens, invasive plant seeds, or plant parts.*

- *Materials removed from construction equipment pursuant to this measure shall be disposed of at an appropriate disposal facility in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.*

- *Trees removed during construction shall be inspected for contagious tree diseases, and diseased trees shall not be transported from the Project site without first being treated using best available management practices relevant for each tree disease observed.*

MM BIO-6: *In accordance with the Invasive Plant and Infectious Tree Disease Mitigation Plan identified in MM BIO-5 for construction across rivers and spreading grounds, t*~~*T*~~he contractor shall wash soil and plant material off all equipment tires and treads *or otherwise clean the construction vehicles and equipment as specified in the Plan* before moving from one construction area, or area of exposed soil, to another (or moving to and from the staging area to the area of exposed soil).

3.2.6 Section 3.4 Cultural Resources

Page 3.4-21. The first paragraph of **Section 3.4.5.4**, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse, 2353 Garfield Avenue (Reference No. 42), is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the city of Commerce:

> The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse is an approximately 300,000-square-foot, one-story reinforced concrete bow truss-roofed warehouse with an attached one-story flat-roof office ell along the north (Washington Boulevard) elevation ~~**(Figure 3.4.6)**~~. ***Figure 3.4.6*** *shows the existing rail alignment north of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse.* Although minor reversible alterations have occurred, the building retains a high level of design integrity.
>
> *The Recirculated Draft EIR table of contents (page xxxi) has been hereby revised to reflect the revised figure name.

Page 3.4-21. The title of **Figure 3.4.6** in **Section 3.4.5.4**, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse, 2353 Garfield Avenue (Reference No. 42), is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the city of Commerce:

Figure 3.4.6. ~~Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse Constructed 1952 and Existing Rail Alignment Facing Washington Boulevard (2353 Garfield Avenue) (View east).~~ *Existing Rail Alignment North of Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse at Washington Boulevard (View north)*

Page 3.4-39. After the third paragraph of **Section 3.4.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options is hereby revised as follows based on an omission in the Recirculated Draft EIR:

> If the Commerce MSF is selected, construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would acquire and demolish the Pacific Metals Company Building, which would be a significant impact.
>
> *Construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would result in a less than significant impact on the South Montebello Irrigation District Building and the William and Florence Kelly House. Neither of these historical resources would be physically demolished, destroyed, relocated, or altered. Under the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, the aerial structure, Greenwood station, and the parking facility to the north would introduce new visual, audible, and atmospheric elements within the immediate surroundings of these two properties. However, the setting of these buildings has already been extensively modified and includes modern infrastructure and uses. Although the proposed station would introduce a permanent visual element directly in front of the South Montebello Irrigation District Building and the William and Florence Kelly House, the relative height of the raised platform will not block any significant views of these historical resources, such as the view of the façades from the sidewalk or the westbound side of Washington Boulevard. The existing setting would be left largely intact. Because the setting of the building is already compromised by modern development and activities, the significance of the South*

Montebello Irrigation District Building and the William and Florence Kelly House would not be materially impaired.

Under Alternative 3 with the Montebello At-Grade Option, the alignment and Greenwood station would be at-grade near the South Montebello Irrigation District Building and William and Florence Kelly House. These resources would not be physically demolished, destroyed, relocated, or altered; however, the at-grade alignment would introduce new visual, audible, and atmospheric elements within its immediate surroundings. The setting of the buildings is modern and adjacent to a major road. The at-grade alignment and station would follow the existing transportation corridor and would not limit views of the resource.

Therefore, construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would result in a less than significant impact on the South Montebello Irrigation District Building and the William and Florence Kelly House.

Overall, construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would result in a significant impact on the Golden Gate Theater and the Pacific Metals Company Building if the Commerce MSF site option is selected.

Page 3.4-48 – Page 3.4-51. The following mitigation measures (MM CUL-1, MM CUL-4, MM CUL-7, MM CUL-8, and MM CUL-9) in **Section 3.4.7**, Project Measures and Mitigation Measures, are hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity:

MM CUL-1: Protection Measures – Differential Settlement/Vibration/TBM Specifications for *CVS/*Golden Gate Theater. *The contractor* ~~Metro~~ shall conduct a pre-construction baseline survey *and building protection report*, implement building protection measures *as specified in the building protection report*, and conduct a post-construction survey of the *CVS/*Golden Gate Theater in relation to Guideway Alignment construction adjacent to the historical resource. Building protection measures shall be implemented in conjunction with MM NOI-1 through NOI-15

- *The contractor* ~~Metro~~ shall conduct a pre-construction survey to establish baseline, preconstruction conditions and to assess the building category and the potential for ground borne vibration to cause damage. Geotechnical investigations shall be undertaken to evaluate soil, groundwater, seismic, and environmental conditions along the alignment. This analysis shall inform the development of appropriate support mechanisms for cut and fill construction areas or areas that could experience differential settlement as a result of using a *tunnel boring machine (TBM)* ~~TBM~~ in close proximity to the historical resource. An architectural historian or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61) shall review final design documents prior to implementation of measures.

- *The contractor* ~~Metro~~ shall implement building protection measures *as identified in the building protection report to protect the structure from vibration damage. This may include methods* such as underpinning, soil grouting, or other forms of ground improvement, as well as lower vibration equipment and/or construction techniques. *If the building*

protection report determines ~~If~~ the historical resource has the potential to be impacted by differential settlement caused by TBM construction, *appropriate building protection measures shall be identified and implemented such as* ~~Metro shall require~~ the use of an earth pressure balance or slurry shield TBM. *The implementation of the required measures and their effectiveness shall be documented in a post-construction survey.*

- A post-construction survey shall also be undertaken to ensure that no significant impacts had occurred to historical resources. An architectural historian or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61) shall prepare an assessment of the implementation of the mitigation measures.

MM CUL-4: Protection Measures – Avoidance for the Dal Rae Restaurant Sign. If Alternative 1 is selected, *the contractor* ~~Metro~~ shall conduct a pre-construction baseline survey, implement building protection measures, and conduct a post-construction survey of the Dal Rae Restaurant Sign in relation to at-grade alignment construction with a sliver property acquisition adjacent to the historical resource.

- *The contractor* ~~Metro~~ shall conduct a pre-construction survey to establish baseline, preconstruction conditions and to assess the potential for damage related to improvements within the sliver property acquisition. An architectural historian or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61) shall review proposed protection measures.

- *The contractor* ~~Metro~~ shall implement building protection measures such as fencing or sensitive construction techniques based on final project design.

- A post-construction survey shall be undertaken to ensure that no significant impacts had occurred to the historical resource. An architectural historian or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61) shall prepare an assessment of the implementation of the mitigation measure.

MM CUL-7: Site of the Battle of Rio San Gabriel. Archaeological monitoring during ground disturbance shall be conducted at the Site of the Battle of Rio San Gabriel, in accordance with the project Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP). The project alignment between Bluff Road in the east and the eastern boundary of the Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds in the west are within the territory through which the Battle of Rio San Gabriel took place and are considered sensitive for cultural resources related to the battle. If monitoring does not reveal any archaeological artifacts, then there would be no effect on the Site of the Battle of Rio San Gabriel. If archaeological artifacts are discovered, *the qualified archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find and then implement the treatment measure plan, if necessary*~~then work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures~~. Treatment measures typically include development of

avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation.

MM CUL-8: Unknown Archaeological Resources. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities, all construction personnel involved in ground-disturbing activities shall be provided with appropriate cultural resources training. The training shall instruct the personnel regarding the legal framework protecting cultural resources, typical kinds of cultural resources that may be found within the project area, and proper procedures and notifications for if cultural resources are inadvertently discovered.

In addition, *the contractor shall retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare* a project–wide *Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP)*~~CRMMP~~ *that shall be implemented during construction*~~shall be developed and implemented by Metro~~. This document shall address areas where potentially significant prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits are likely to be located within the ADI based on background research and a geoarchaeological analysis. Preparation of the CRMMP shall necessitate the completion of pedestrian survey of the private property parcels in the ADI that were not accessible during the preparation of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Cultural Resources Impacts Report.

The CRMMP shall include a detailed prehistoric and historic context that clearly demonstrates the themes under which any identified subsurface deposits would be determined significant. Should significant deposits be identified during earth-moving activities, the CRMMP shall address methods for data recovery, anticipated artifact types, artifact analysis, report writing, repatriation of human remains and associated grave goods, and curation.

The CRMMP shall also require that ~~an archaeologist qualified in prehistoric and historical archaeology~~ *a qualified Archaeologist in prehistoric and historical archaeology (36 CFR Part 61)* be retained prior to ground-disturbing activities. The CRMMP will be a guide for monitoring activities. If buried cultural resources, such as flaked or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or non-human bone, are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, *halt* work ~~will stop~~ in that area and within 50 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures*. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation.* As detailed in *MM* TCR-1, a Native American monitor shall be retained if treatment involve~~d~~*s* work at a prehistoric site, or *to monitor ground disturbing activities* at other locations determined appropriate during tribal consultation. ~~Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation.~~ *An archaeological monitor will be retained for work at locations identified as sensitive during tribal consultation that require a tribal monitor or other locations identified as likely to contain archaeological resources. Identified areas shall be monitored by, or under the supervision of, the qualified Archaeologist, in accordance with the*

Project CRMMP. If during cultural resources monitoring the qualified archaeologist determines that the sediments being excavated are previously disturbed or unlikely to contain significant cultural materials, the qualified archaeologist can specify that monitoring be reduced or eliminated.

MM CUL-9: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. If human remains are discovered, work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be suspended and the Los Angeles County Coroner contacted. If the remains are deemed Native American in origin, the Coroner shall contact the NAHC and identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The MLD may inspect the site within 48 hours of being notified and issue recommendations for scientific removal and nondestructive analysis. If the MLD fails to make recommendations, then Metro and/or the landowner may rebury the remains in a location not subject to further disturbance at their discretion. Work may be resumed at the ~~landowner's~~ discretion *of Metro* but will only commence after consultation and treatment have been concluded. Work may continue on other parts of the project while consultation and treatment are conducted.

3.2.7 Section 3.5 Energy

Page 3.5-11. **Section 3.5.5.2**, Transportation Sector. The last paragraph on page 3.5-11 is hereby revised as follows as a correction:

As shown in **Table 3.5-1**, existing conditions data for regional traffic energy consumption was modeled for the existing conditions year of 2019. The annual automobile energy consumption data for the region was developed as part of the Project transportation model. Highway traffic in the region was estimated to consume approximately 6.28 billion gallons of gasoline and 239 million gallons of diesel fuel under the Existing Conditions, equating to approximately 787,613 billion BTUs. ~~No LRT operates within the GSA under the existing conditions.~~ *Under existing conditions, LRT operates in the GSA from the western boundary to the existing E Line terminus at Atlantic Station in East Los Angeles.*

3.2.8 Section 3.6 Geology, Soils and Paleontological Resources

Page 3.6-43 – 3.6-44. PM GEO-1 in **Section 3.6.7.1**, Project Measures, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

PM GEO-1: The Build Alternatives shall be designed and constructed per the ~~2018~~ Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC). The MRDC incorporates various design specifications from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the State of California, the County of Los Angeles, and other sources by reference. Key compliance sections of the MRDC relative to geology and soils are Section 5.3, Section 5.4, Section 5.6, and MRDC Section 5 Appendix, Metro Supplemental Seismic Design Criteria. Section 5.6 of the MRDC provides detailed requirements for planning and conducting a geotechnical investigation, geotechnical design methodologies,

and reporting. In addition, Caltrans and the County of Los Angeles Building Code (based on the California Building Code [CBC]) have independent design criteria for bridges and aerial structures (Caltrans) and building structures (County of Los Angeles) that are also required. In accordance with the MRDC, geotechnical report recommendations shall be incorporated into the project plans and specifications. These recommendations shall be a product of final design and shall address potential subsurface hazards. Without these report recommendations, the project plans and specifications shall not be approved and the Build Alternatives will not be allowed to advance into the final design stage or into construction.

Page 3.6-44 – 3.6-45. The following mitigation measures (MM GEO-1, MM GEO-2, MM GEO-3, and MM GEO-4) in **Section 3.6.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, are hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

MM GEO-1: *The Contractor*~~Metro~~ shall retain a qualified paleontologist and a qualified paleontological monitor to carry out the following tasks: *Prepare a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (PRMMP) that includes identification and mapping of the areas of high sensitivity to be monitored during construction. These areas are defined as all areas within the Older alluvium in the project site where planned excavation will exceed three feet below the surface or three feet into undisturbed sediments and all areas within the Younger alluvium in the project site where planned excavation will exceed 10 feet below the surface or 10 feet into undisturbed sediments.* The qualified paleontologist shall supervise the qualified paleontological monitor to monitor excavation in areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources *with the exception of TBM excavation, where monitoring is infeasible.* ~~These areas are defined as all areas within the Older alluvium in the project site where planned excavation will exceed three feet below the surface or three feet into undisturbed sediments and all areas within the Younger alluvium in the project site where planned excavation will exceed 10 feet below the surface or 10 feet into undisturbed sediments.~~ The qualified paleontologist shall retain the option to reduce monitoring if, in his or her professional opinion, sediments being monitored are previously disturbed. Monitoring may also be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units are determined to have low potential to contain fossil resources.

MM GEO-2: *Monitoring for paleontological resources and salvage of fossils shall occur in compliance with the Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (PRMMP) required by mitigation measure MM GEO-1. The PRMMP* ~~Metro~~ shall *specify* ~~make sure~~ that the qualified paleontologist and the qualified paleontological monitor are equipped to salvage fossils and samples of sediment as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Since Older alluvium yields small fossil specimens (microvertebrate fossils) likely to go unnoticed during typical large-scale paleontological monitoring, *the PRMMP shall identify that* matrix samples shall be collected and processed to determine the potential for small fossils to be recovered prior to substantial excavations in those sediments. If this sampling indicates that these units do possess small fossils, a matrix sample of 6,000 pounds shall be collected at various locations, to be specified by the paleontologist, within the construction area. These matrix samples shall also be processed for small fossils.

MM GEO-3: *The Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (PRMMP) required under mitigation measure MM GEO-1 shall specify procedures for the discovery, recovery, preparation, and analysis of significant paleontological resources encountered during construction, in accordance with standards for recovery, reporting, and curation established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP).* The qualified paleontologist shall make certain that recovered specimens be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils.

MM GEO-4: *Curation of specimens shall occur in compliance with the Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (PRMMP) required by mitigation measure MM GEO-1. The PRMMP* ~~Metro~~ shall *identify criteria for identifying* ~~make certain that~~ specimens *to* ~~shall~~ be curated into a professional accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable storage. A report of findings, with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, shall be prepared. The report and inventory, when submitted to the professional accredited museum repository, shall signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

3.2.9 Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Page 3.8-21. The last sentence of the first paragraph of **Section 3.8.5.6**, Subsurface Gas Conditions and Oil and Gas Wells, is hereby revised as follows as a correction:

> However, the May 2021 Final Draft ISA Report notes that methane, hydrogen sulfide, and other oil ~~filed~~ *field* related gases could be present in the vicinity of oil and gas wells.

Page 3.8-24 – 3.8-25. **Section 3.8.5.9**, Proximity to Schools, is hereby revised to include two additional schools based on public comments received from the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and updated existing conditions:

> The following schools are located within one-quarter mile from the Alternative 1 alignment:
>
> - George Washington Elementary School, 7804 S. Thornlake Avenue, Whittier
> - Pioneer High School located at 10800 Benavon Street, Whittier
> - Ada S. Nelson Elementary School, 8140 South Vicki Drive, Whittier
> - Rivera Middle School located at 7200 Citronell Avenue, Pico Rivera
> - El Rancho High School located at 6501 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera
> - Greenwood Elementary School located at 900 South Greenwood Avenue, Montebello
> - Calvary Chapel Christian Academy, 931 South Maple Avenue, Montebello

- KIPP Promesa Prep located at 5156 Whittier Boulevard, Los Angeles
- KIPP Raices Academy located at 668 South Atlantic Boulevard, East Los Angeles
- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles
- St. Alphonsus School, 552 South Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School, 4765 East Fourth Street, Los Angeles
- Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, 5115 Via Corona Street, Los Angeles

Page 3.8-35 – Page 3.8-36. The last paragraph of **Section 3.8.6.2.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology and to improve clarity:

> Thus, MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-5, as discussed in **Section 3.8.7**, would be implemented. MM HAZ-1 requires a Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~ to be conducted before ground disturbing activities occur to determine the potential presence of petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and VOCs in soil and/or groundwater. MM HAZ-2 requires the preparation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan in consultation with LARWQCB that identifies and delineates contaminated areas; provides procedures for handling, excavating, and managing excavated soils and dewatering effluent and for notifying appropriate agencies; and provides requirements for site-specific *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~health and safety plans~~. MM HAZ-3 requires contractors to inspect soil and groundwater for signs of contamination, and if contaminated soil or groundwater is found, *halt work and test materials* ~~stop work within and cordon of the area, notify and coordinate with appropriate agencies~~, and develop an investigation and site-specific management plan. MM HAZ-4 requires the contractor to prepare site-specific *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~worker health and safety plans~~ that identify human health risks from hazardous materials and appropriate protocols to ensure worker safety.

Page 3.8-44. The first sentence of **Section 3.8.6.3.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

> As identified in Section 3.8.5.9, ~~15~~17 K-12 schools are located within one-quarter mile from Alternative 1.

Page 3.8-45. The first paragraph of **Section 3.8.6.3.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Construction of Alternative 1 would involve handling of hazardous materials. Such activities, if not appropriately managed, could result in hazardous emissions that would potentially affect nearby schools. As identified in Section 3.8.5.9, ~~15~~17 K-12 schools are located within one-quarter mile from the Alternative 1 alignment.

Page 3.8-45. The second paragraph of **Section 3.8.6.3.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Parcels proposed for construction staging and construction easements would occur on sites with known hazardous materials releases within one-quarter mile of Greenwood Elementary School (APNs 6352-007-059 and 6352-007-060 [Site 18]), KIPP Promesa Prep and KIPP Raices Academy (APN 6340-001-001 [Site 5] and APN 6340-001-002 [Site 6]), and 4th Street Elementary, ~~and~~ Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* (APNs 5248-004-040 and 5248-004-043 [Site 1], APN 6341-001-038 [Site 2], APN 6341-001-017 [Site 3], and APN 5248-008-046 [Site 4]) as shown in **Table 3.8-1**).

Pages 3.8-46 – Page 3.8-47. **Section 3.8.6.3.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

The following ~~six~~ *eight* K-12 schools are located within one-quarter mile from the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option alignment:

- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles
- St. Alphonsus School, 552 South Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School, 4765 East Fourth Street, Los Angeles
- Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, 5115 Via Corona Street, Los Angeles

Pages 3.8-47. **Section 3.8.6.3.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Parcels proposed for construction staging and construction easements would occur on sites with known hazardous materials releases within one-quarter mile of 4th Street Elementary School, ~~and~~ Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* (APNs 5248-004-040 and 5248-004-043 [Site 1], APN 6341-001-038 [Site 2], APN 6341-001-017 [Site 3], and APN 5248-008-046 [Site 4]) as shown in **Table 3.8-1**.

Page 3.8-48. **Section 3.8.6.3.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

The following ~~ten~~ *twelve* K-12 schools are located within one-quarter mile from the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option alignment:

- Greenwood Elementary School located at 900 South Greenwood Avenue, Montebello
- Calvary Chapel Christian Academy, 931 South Maple Avenue, Montebello
- KIPP Promesa Prep located at 5156 Whittier Boulevard, Los Angeles
- KIPP Raices Academy located at 668 South Atlantic Boulevard, East Los Angeles
- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles
- St. Alphonsus School, 552 South Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School, 4765 East Fourth Street, Los Angeles
- Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, 5115 Via Corona Street, Los Angeles

Page 3.8-49. The last paragraph of **Section 3.8.6.3.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Parcels proposed for construction staging and construction easements would occur on sites with known hazardous materials releases within one-quarter mile of Greenwood Elementary School (APNs 6352-007-059 and 6352-007-060 [Site 18]), KIPP Promesa Prep and KIPP Raices Academy (APN 6340- 001-001 [Site 5] and APN 6340-001-002 [Site 6]), and 4th Street Elementary, ~~and~~ Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* (APNs 5248-004-040 and 5248-004-043 [Site 1], APN 6341-001- 038 [Site 2], APN 6341-001-017 [Site 3], and APN 5248-008-046 [Site 4]) as shown in **Table 3.8-1**.

Page 3.8-65 – Page 3.8-68. The following project measures (PM HAZ-1, PM HAZ-2, PM HAZ-3, and PM HAZ-4) in Section 3.8.7.1, Project Measures, are hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and terminology:

PM HAZ-1: Operational ~~(post Project)~~ BMPs for the Build Alternatives shall include but not be limited to:

- *The contractor*~~Metro~~ shall coordinate with fire and police protection officials when designing grade crossings to ensure that emergency access would be maintained. *Metro shall be included in all correspondence with third parties.*

PM HAZ-2: Construction BMPs for the Build Alternatives shall include but not be limited to:

- Development of a stormwater pollution prevent plan (SWPPP) in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Construction Clean Water Act Section 402 General Permit conditions, and subject to regular inspections by applicable jurisdiction(s) to ensure compliance. The SWPPP shall include specifications for the following but not limited to:
    - Report hazardous spills to the designated *Certified Unified Program Agency (*CUPA*)* (i.e., Los Angeles County Fire Department Health Hazardous Materials Division or Santa Fe Springs Department of Fire-Rescue) and implement clean up immediately and proper disposal of contaminated soil at a licensed facility.
- Contaminated soils and hazardous building materials and wastes shall be disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements at landfills serving *the* Los Angeles County *region*.
- ~~Metro s~~*S*tandard practices shall be followed that include scheduling of lane and/or road closures to minimize disruptions and preparation of a Traffic Management Plan (see MM TRA-1) that is approved *with authorities having jurisdiction* in coordination with local fire and police departments prior to construction.

PM HAZ-3: Operational (post construction) BMPs for the MSF Site Options shall include but shall not be limited to:

- If the quantity of hazardous materials used, handled, or stored on-site would exceed the regulatory thresholds, of 55 gallons for a hazardous liquid; 500 pounds of a hazardous solid; 200 cubic feet for any compressed gas; or threshold planning quantities of an extremely hazardous substance per Chapter 6.95 California Health and Safety Code, Metro shall prepare a~~n~~ *Hazardous Materials Business Plan (*HMBP*)* in accordance with all related requirements of the California Health and Safety Code, chapter 6.95, Articles 1 and 2. The plan shall be reviewed and recertified every year and amended as required by the Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95, Articles 1 and 2.
- Compliance with applicable ~~city of Commerce or c~~*C*ity of Montebello design criteria (as applicable) pertaining to emergency vehicle access as well as the California Fire Code standards shall ensure that sufficient ingress and egress routes are provided to the MSF site options.

PM HAZ-4: Construction BMPs for the MSF Site Options shall include but shall not be limited to:

- ~~Both the federal OSHA and~~ Cal/OSHA regulates worker exposure during construction activities that disturb LBP. Any ACMs, if present, require appropriate abatement of identified asbestos prior to demolition pursuant to the SCAQMD Rule 1403.

- ~~Metro s~~Standard practices shall be followed that include scheduling of lane and/or road closures and detours to minimize disruptions and preparation of a Traffic Management Plan (see MM TRA-1) that is approved *with the authorities having jurisdiction* in coordination with local fire and police departments prior to construction.

Page 3.8-69 – Page 3.8-70. MM HAZ-1 in **Section 3.8.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Additionally, MM HAZ-1, MM HAZ-2, MM HAZ-3, and MM HAZ-4 are hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and terminology:

MM HAZ-1: Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~ (*ESA*~~ESI~~). ~~Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and b~~*B*efore any substantial ground disturbance occurs on or near the properties with documented releases, Metro shall hire a qualified environmental professional to conduct a Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment*~~Investigation~~ to determine the potential presence of petroleum hydrocarbons, metals *(i.e., lead that was aerially deposited and lead chromate) that exceed thresholds established by the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22*, and VOCs in soil and/or groundwater in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the Draft Final Initial Site Assessment Report prepared for Alternative 1 (Washington Alternative) (Kleinfelder 2021).

The Phase II *ESA*~~ESI~~ shall include sufficient soil and groundwater sampling and laboratory analysis to identify the types of chemicals and their respective concentrations. The Phase II *ESA*~~Environmental Site Investigation~~ shall compare soil and groundwater sampling results against applicable environmental screening levels developed by the Los Angeles *Regional Water Quality Control Board (*RWQCB*)* and/or *the Department of Toxic Substances Control (*DTSC*)*. If the Phase II *ESA*~~Environmental Site Investigation~~ identifies contaminant concentrations above the screening levels, a site-specific soil and groundwater management plan shall be prepared and implemented as described in Mitigation Measure HAZ-2. Metro shall consult with the Los Angeles RWQCB, DTSC, and/or other appropriate regulatory agencies to ensure sufficient minimization of risk to human health and the environment is completed.

MM HAZ-2: Soil and Groundwater Management Plan. *Prior to excavation*~~Prior to the issuance of a grading permit~~, a site-specific soil and groundwater management plan shall be prepared by ~~Metro or~~ Metro's contractor to address handling and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater prior to demolition, excavation and construction activities. Metro shall consult with the Los Angeles RWQCB, DTSC, and/or other appropriate regulatory agencies to ensure sufficient minimization of risk to human health and the environment is completed. The

soil and groundwater management plan shall specify all necessary procedures to ensure the safe handling and disposing of excavated soil, groundwater, and/or dewatering effluent in a manner that is protective of human health and in accordance with federal and state hazardous waste disposal laws, and with state and local stormwater and sanitary sewer requirements~~.~~. At a minimum, *this* shall include the following:

- Identification and delineation of contaminated areas and procedures for limiting access to such areas to properly trained personnel;
- Step-by-step procedures for handling, excavating, characterizing, and managing excavated soils and dewatering effluent, including procedures for containing, handling, and disposing of hazardous waste, procedures for containing, handling, and disposing of groundwater generated from construction dewatering, the method used to analyze excavated materials and groundwater for hazardous materials likely to be encountered at specific locations, appropriate treatment and/or disposal methods;
- Procedures for notification and reporting, including notifying and reporting to internal management and to local agencies;
- Minimum requirements for site-specific health and safety plans, to protect the general public and workers in the construction area.
- *Prior to excavation,* ~~Prior to the issuance of grading permits,~~ *the Contractor shall prepare the* Soil and Groundwater Management Plan and the results of environmental sampling shall be provided to contractors who shall be responsible for developing their own construction worker *safety manuals and construction work plans* ~~health and safety plans (HASPs)~~ and training requirements, per MM HAZ-4.
- Metro's contractor shall sample groundwater suspected of contamination. If any *contaminated* groundwater is encountered during construction, the contractor will stop work in the vicinity, cordon off the area, and contact Metro and will immediately notify RWQCB. In coordination with the RWQCB, an investigation and remediation plan will be developed in order to protect public health and the environment. Any hazardous or toxic materials will be disposed according to local, state, and federal regulations.

MM HAZ-3: Contractor Specifications. Metro shall include in its contractor specifications the following requirement relating to hazardous materials:

- During all ground-disturbing activities, the contractor(s) shall inspect the exposed soil and groundwater for obvious signs of contamination, such as odors, stains, or other suspect materials. Qualified personnel shall monitor for volatile organic compounds and other subsurface gases for concentrations exceeding *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)* ~~EPA~~ Regional Screening Levels and/or *Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)* ~~DTSC~~ Screening Levels with a Photoionization Detector. Should signs of unanticipated contamination be encountered, work shall

be *halted and materials tested* ~~suspended, and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health shall be notified, and the area secured~~. An investigation shall be designed and performed to verify the presence and extent of contamination at the site, and a site-specific soil and groundwater management plan, as described under Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 above, shall be prepared and implemented.

MM HAZ-4: *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans*~~Worker Health and Safety Plan~~. The contractor shall prepare site-specific *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans that address worker health and safety*~~HASPs~~ to protect the general public and workers in the construction area *for Metro's review and approval*. The *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~HASP~~ shall be prepared in accordance with State and *California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA)*~~federal OSHA~~ regulations. Copies of the *plans*~~HASP~~ shall be made available to construction workers for review during their orientation and/or regular health and safety meetings. The *plans*~~HASP~~ shall identify chemicals of concern, potential hazards, worker training requirements, personal protective equipment and devices, decontamination procedures, the need for personal or area monitoring, and emergency response procedures. The *plans*~~HASP~~ shall be amended, as necessary, if new information becomes available that could affect implementation of the plan.

3.2.10 Section 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 3.9-4. The third paragraph of **Section 3.9.2.2.4**, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

The SWRCB also administers the Construction General Permit, which is applicable to all stormwater discharges associated with construction activity (*Order WQ 2022-0057-DWQ, NPDES NO. CAS000002* ~~Order #2012-0006-DWQ~~). The main objectives of the Construction General Permit are erosion and sediment discharges from construction sites, preventing construction materials from contacting stormwater, preventing unauthorized discharges from construction sites, implementing sampling and analysis programs, and establishing maintenance commitments on post-construction pollution control measures. The Construction General Permit requirements apply to any construction project that results in the disturbance of 1 acre of land or greater or that is part of a larger common development plan. More information about application requirements, best management practices (BMPs), and monitoring requirements is provided in Appendix J.

Page 3.9-5. **Section 3.9.2.3.1**, NPDES Permits, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

LARWQCB is responsible for issuing the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit (*Order No. R4 2021 0105, NPDES Permit No. CAS004004* ~~Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES No. CAS 004001, as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075 on June 16, 2015 and Los Angeles Water Board Order R4-2012-0175-A01 on September 8, 2016, and as modified by LARWQCB on July 9, 2018~~). The existing permit covers the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD), Los Angeles County, and *85*~~84~~ incorporated cities within the coastal watersheds of Los Angeles County, including the cities and unincorporated county in the DSAs (~~LARWQCB 2016~~ *LARWQCB 2021b*). The permit covers the permittees for discharges of

stormwater and urban runoff from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements.

The objectives of MS4 permits are to prohibit non-stormwater discharges through MS4s to the region's waterways, to reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable, and to implement other pollutant controls as necessary to achieve water quality standards (~~LARWQCB 2014~~*LARWQCB 2021b*). The current MS4 permit allows permittees to develop Watershed Management Programs (WMP) ~~or Enhanced Watershed Management Programs (EWMP)~~ to implement MS4 permit requirements, through BMPs, control measures, and customized strategies targeted at the watershed level. The current MS4 permit imposes basic programs, or minimum control measures, that mitigate stormwater quality issues. These programs and measures are discussed in more detail in Appendix J.

Page 3.9-6. **Section 3.9.2.3.5**, Watershed Management and Enhanced Watershed Management Programs, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

According to the ~~most current~~ *previous* MS4 Order *(Order Number R4-2012-0175),* the ultimate goal of the WMP ~~and EWMP~~ is to ensure that "discharges from the Los Angeles County MS4: (i) achieve applicable water quality-based effluent limitations that implement TMDLs, (ii) do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations, and (iii) for non-stormwater discharges from the MS4, are not sources of pollutants to receiving waters." The WMP allows permittees to develop and customize control measures to address water quality issues within their watershed management areas. *Under the current MS4, "approved WMP" includes WMPs and Enhanced Watershed Management Programs (EWMPs) that were developed pursuant to the previous MS4 permits (Order Number R4-2012-0175 and Order Number R4- 2014-0024).* Plans relevant to the DSAs include the Upper Los Angeles River Watershed's EWMP, approved in 2016, the Lower San Gabriel River WMP, approved in 2015 and modified in 2017, and the Los Angeles River Upper Reach 2 Coordinated Integrated Monitoring Program, approved in 2016 (LARWQCB 2019b).

Page 3.9-13. The first paragraph of **Section 3.9.5.3**, Groundwater Supplies and Recharge, is hereby revised as follows based on coordination with and input from Caltrans:

Data from LACDPW on groundwater wells in the vicinity of the DSAs show lower groundwater tables (more than 50 feet below ground surface [bgs]) in the western and southern portions of the DSAs and higher (less than 50 feet bgs) groundwater tables near the spreading grounds (LACDPW 2019). *Based on LACDPW data (LACDPW 2019) the groundwater wells in the vicinity of the underground alignment are approximately 120 to 180 feet bgs. Based on information reported to LARWQCB, the depth to the first layer of groundwater encountered from the ground surface in the vicinity of the underground guideway ranged between approximately 100 to 130 feet bgs in 2005 (LARWQCB 2005).*

Page 3.9-17. The last paragraph of **Section 3.9.5.6**, Municipal Water Supply, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

The LACDPW maintains a database of groundwater supply wells that identify groundwater wells near the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River (LACDPW 2019). ~~Additionally, there are 10 municipal water wells located within approximately 0.5 miles of the proposed underground guideway portion of the Build Alternatives and the aerial portion of Alternatives 1 and 3. There is one municipal well located approximately 0.5 miles from the at-grade portion of Alternative~~

~~1. Most of these wells are located approximately 1,800 feet or more away from the Build Alternatives.~~ *According to this database, the majority of groundwater wells in or near the DSA are near the Rio Hondo. Most drinking water wells are located approximately 0.4 miles or more away from the Build Alternatives. One drinking water well is located approximately 200 feet west of the underground portion of the Build Alternatives. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs.*

Page 3.9-17. The second paragraph of **Section 3.9.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> The Project could result in potential direct impacts on surface water quality, primarily the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River, by increasing stormwater runoff and producing contaminants typically associated with transit, such as oil and grease, that could be carried by the stormwater runoff into surface waters. However, operations would be subject to the LARWQCB MS4 NPDES permit (~~Order No. R4-2012-0175 and NPDES No. CAS004001~~*Order No. R4 2021 0105, NPDES Permit No. CAS004004*) and its associated BMPs for activities such as roadway paving or repair operation and public agency facilities and activities.

Page 3.9-21. The fifth paragraph of **Section 3.9.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

> MM HAZ-2, discussed in **Section 3.9.7**, requires the preparation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan in consultation with LARWQCB *and other appropriate regulatory agencies*. The plan would identify and delineate contaminated areas; provide procedures for handling, excavating, and managing excavated soils and dewatering effluent and for notifying appropriate agencies; and provide requirements for site-specific *safety manuals and construction work plans* ~~health and safety plans~~. Thus, implementation of MM HAZ-2 would help minimize the spread of contaminated groundwater and would reduce this potential impact from construction of Alternative 1 to less than significant.

Page 3.9-21. The sixth paragraph of **Section 3.9.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and terminology:

> MM HAZ-3 is discussed in **Section 3.9.7** and requires contractors to inspect groundwater for signs of contamination, and if contaminated groundwater is found, *halt work and test materials* ~~stop work in the vicinity of area, cordon off the area, notify and coordinate with appropriate agencies~~, and develop an investigation and site-specific groundwater management plan to ensure contaminants are not spread. Thus, implementation of MM HAZ-3 would reduce this potential impact from construction of Alternative 1 to less than significant.

Page 3.9-30. The first paragraph in **Section 3.9.6.2.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

> Construction of Alternative 1 could impact groundwater supplies and recharge because dewatering activities have the potential to lower the groundwater table. Groundwater dewatering would take place during construction, particularly during the construction of the underground guideway and station construction. ~~However, the closest groundwater well is approximately 1,800 feet away from the underground guideway, and thus dewatering would not be expected to affect groundwater wells.~~ Additionally, groundwater well depths are relatively deep near the underground alignment, which would reduce the likelihood that groundwater would be encountered during construction of the tunnel. The tunnel would only

be up to 60 feet deep, and the water table would likely be below or at the lower level of construction activities *(as described in **Section 3.9.5.3**, the groundwater depth in the vicinity of the proposed underground guideway is approximately 100 to 130 feet bgs). Since the water table would likely be below or at the lower level of construction activities, the amount of water that would need to be extracted, cleaned, and disposed of during construction would be minimal. Further, as discussed in **Section 3.9.5.6**, the majority of groundwater wells are located 0.4 miles or farther away from the Alternative 1 alignment, and thus, dewatering would not be expected to affect these groundwater wells. The closest groundwater well is approximately 200 feet west of the underground guideway. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs, which is well below the depth of the tunnel. Given that the amount of dewatering is expected to be minimal due to the depth of the water table and the closest groundwater well is well below the maximum tunnel depth, groundwater wells would not be adversely affected by the Project.* ~~Thus, the amount of water that would need to be extracted, cleaned, and disposed of during construction would be minimal.~~

Page 3.9-32. The second paragraph in **Section 3.9.6.2.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

Dewatering activities have the potential to lower the groundwater table and contaminate groundwater resources. ~~However, the closest groundwater well is approximately 1,800 feet away~~ *As discussed in **Section 3.9.5.6**, the majority of groundwater wells are located 0.4 miles or farther away* from the base Alternative 2 underground guideway and the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, which shifts the guideway slightly to the east of Atlantic Boulevard between Beverly Boulevard and 4th Street. Thus, dewatering would not be expected to affect *these* groundwater wells. *The closest groundwater well is approximately 200 feet west of the underground guideway. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs, which is well below the depth of the tunnel at 60 feet.* Additionally, groundwater depths are relatively deep near the underground alignment, which would reduce the likelihood that groundwater would be encountered during construction of the tunnel. Since the water table would likely be below or at the lower level of construction activities, the amount of water that would need to be extracted, cleaned, and disposed of during construction would be minimal.

Page 3.9-33. The second paragraph in **Section 3.9.6.2.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

Dewatering activities have the potential to lower the groundwater table and contaminate groundwater resources. ~~However, the closest groundwater well is approximately 1,800 feet away~~ *As discussed in **Section 3.9.5.6**, the majority of groundwater wells are located 0.4 miles or farther away* from the base Alternative 3 underground guideway and the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, which shifts the guideway slightly to the east of Atlantic Boulevard. Thus, dewatering would not be expected to affect *these* groundwater wells. *The closest groundwater well is approximately 200 feet west of the underground guideway. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs, which is well below the depth of the tunnel at 60 feet.* Additionally, groundwater depths are relatively deep near the underground alignment, which would reduce the likelihood that groundwater would be encountered during construction of the tunnel. Since the water table would likely be below or at the lower level of construction activities, the amount of water that would need to be extracted, cleaned, and disposed of during construction would be minimal.

Page 3.9-61. PM HWQ-1 in **Section 3.9.7.1**, Project Measures, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

PM HWQ-1: Operational (post-Project) BMPs for the Build Alternatives (may include but shall not be limited to):

- Design ~~efforts~~ to reduce impervious surfaces.

Page 3.9-62. PM HWQ-2 in **Section 3.9.7.1**, Project Measures is hereby revised as follows to include the following bullets at the end of the measure in response to public comments received from CDFW and to improve clarity:

PM HWQ-2: Construction BMPs for the Build Alternatives (may include but shall not be limited to):...

- Locating staging areas outside of the spreading grounds *and rivers* ~~and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) right-of-way (ROW) areas~~ where possible.
- *To protect fish and wildlife species, Metro shall prohibit the use of erosion control materials potentially harmful to fish and wildlife species, such as mono-filament netting or similar material, in stream areas. Metro shall require the use of certified weed-free material for erosion control when working in areas of exposed soil.*
- *Metro shall not allow drill cuttings, drilling mud, and/or materials or water contaminated with bentonite, or any other substance deemed deleterious to fish or wildlife, to enter the stream or be placed where they may be washed into the stream. Any contaminated water/materials from the drilling and/or project activities shall be pumped or placed into a holding facility and removed for proper disposal. The contractor shall develop a frac-out contingency plan, which will establish operational procedures and responsibilities for the prevention, containment, and clean-up of frac-outs associated with proposed drilling activities.*

Page 3.9-63. MM HWQ-2 in **Section 3.9.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from CDFW and to improve clarity:

MM HWQ-2: To compensate for potential loss of flood storage due to placement of LRT bridge piers or enhanced bridge supports in *federally authorized and* LACDPW flood control facilities, Metro shall construct compensatory mitigation within the impacted flood control facility based on the volume of the flood storage loss and hydraulic analysis *in compliance with applicable Federal, state, and local requirements, such as the Rivers and Harbors Act Section 408 program*. Exact compensatory mitigation requirements shall be determined based on the volume of the loss of flood storage and a hydraulic analysis of the impacts on flood storage and flood flows. The compensatory storage must allow floodwaters to flow freely into and out of the storage area in a similar manner as pre-Project conditions. In general, the compensatory mitigation shall occur at or below the elevation of the impact and the hydraulics of the mitigation design must function to prevent any change in flood elevations upstream of the DSA of Alternative 1. The area chosen for compensatory mitigation must be free draining (e.g., pooled water must be able to flow out of the storage area as floodwaters recede) and shall comply with drainage requirements of LACDPW. *A hydrology report to assess changes in hydrologic activity, velocity of*

flows, and water availability onsite and downstream of the Project and assess scour or erosion at the Project site will be prepared and submitted to CDFW in conjunction with the Lake and Streambed Alteration Notification for the Project.

3.2.11 Section 3.10 Land Use and Planning

Page 3.10-1. **Section 3.10.2**, Regulatory Framework, is hereby revised to include the following federal regulation in response to public comments:

3.10.2.0 Federal

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) mandates that certain relocation services and payments be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced as a direct result of projects undertaken by a federal agency or with federal financial assistance. The Uniform Act provides for uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced from their homes or businesses and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies. Relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to displaced businesses in compliance with state regulations and Metro's policies. However, economic impacts could occur to other businesses that depend on the revenue generated by transactions with businesses that would be displaced by the Project. Under the regulations of the Uniform Act, since the businesses that experience those economic impacts would not be displaced by the Project, they would not be eligible for financial assistance under the Uniform Act.

Page 3.10-1. **Section 3.10.2.1**, State, is hereby revised to include the following state regulation in response to public comments:

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.

Page 3.10-9. **Section 3.10.6.1.1**, the second paragraph of Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 3.10-10. **Section 3.10.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 3.10-11. The second paragraph of **Section 3.10.6.1.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 3.10-13. The second paragraph of **Section 3.10.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 3.10-20. **Section 3.10.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments and to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process. Property acquisition would be generally limited to properties currently zoned for commercial or industrial uses, and no residential uses, churches, schools, parks, or other sensitive land uses would be permanently acquired. *Relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to displaced businesses in compliance with federal and state regulations and Metro's policies. Because the properties acquired for construction activities would be available for future use under the same land use designations, property acquisitions are not anticipated to result in economic or social harm that could lead to physical impacts such as deterioration of surrounding businesses. While economic impacts could occur to other businesses that depend on the revenue generated by transactions with businesses that would be displaced by the Project, since 2014, Metro has launched pilot programs that provide financial assistance to small businesses located along rail*

corridors under construction. These programs include a Metro Business Interruption Fund, a Metro Business Solution Center, and Metro's Eat Shop Play Local business mitigation program meant to bring focused attention to local businesses affected by Metro construction, would be implemented. Additionally, Metro's Construction Relations Officers will work with local businesses to provide signage and marketing assistance, such as providing "Open During Construction," wayfinding, and promotional signage for businesses. The property acquisition for construction under Alternative 1 would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Construction of Alternative 1 would be conducted in compliance with local land use plans and codes, including the provision of noise control measures in order to avoid conflict with the goals of local noise ordinances. Therefore, the construction of Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impact.

Page 3.10-20 – Page 3.10-21. **Section 3.10.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 3.10-22. **Section 3.10.6.2.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, and **Section 3.10.6.2.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments and to improve clarity:

The properties under construction easements would retain their original land use designation and zoning classifications, and upon termination of the construction easement, would return to their original use. Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes from this environmental review process. Property acquisition would be generally limited to properties currently zoned for commercial or industrial uses. *Relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to displaced businesses in compliance with federal and state regulations and Metro's policies. Because the properties acquired for construction activities would be available for future use under the same land use designations, property acquisitions are not anticipated to result in economic or social harm that could lead to physical impacts such as deterioration of surrounding businesses.*

3.2.12 Section 3.11 Noise and Vibration

Page 3.11-18. The second paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.1.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Impacts from Traction Power Substations, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency:

TPSS would be installed at several locations along the proposed rail corridor to provide adequate electrical power for LRT service. As set forth in PM NOI-1 (described in **Section 3.11.7**), each TPSS would be designed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) of 45 dBA at 50 feet or at the setback line of the nearest building or occupied area, whichever is closer ~~(Metro 2018)~~.

Page 3.11-21. The fourth paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> The Project also includes a tunnel section, which would involve excavation and shoring of the launching and receiving pits and tunneling with the use of the TBM. Ventilation would be required during construction and operation of Alternative 1 for adequate circulation of air flow in the tunnels. Tunnel vent fans would be located at ground surface level and their activation would increase ambient noise levels for their surrounding areas and would therefore result in a potentially significant impact. Tunneling activities would require the use of machinery to remove excavation spoils ~~(i.e., muck)~~ from the TBM. *Spoil* ~~Muck~~ removal and heavy machinery such as excavators and mini-excavators to move TBM spoils would be a source of noise during construction activities that could increase ambient noise levels.

Pages 3.11-23 to 3.11-24. The ninth paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.1.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency:

> Compliance with project measures discussed in **Section 3.11.7.1** would reduce potential noise impacts. As described in PM NOI-1, each TPSS would be designed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) of 45 dBA at 50 feet or at the setback line of the nearest building or occupied area, whichever is closer ~~(Metro 2018)~~. Additionally, as described in PM NOI-2, all construction activities would be carried out in compliance with Metro's baseline specifications Section 01_56_19, Construction Noise and Vibration Control to reduce noise generation associated with construction activities to the degree feasible by using methods that may include, but not be limited to, conducting *at-grade* construction *adjacent to residential neighborhoods* in daytime hours *whenever practicable*, using construction equipment with noise-suppression devices, and using noise barriers or other noise control measures.

Page 3.11-24. The final paragraphs of **Section 3.11.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity:

> MM NOI-1 would require implementation of a noise control plan and construction monitoring plan that would meet, at minimum, the FTA general assessment noise criteria *for daytime and nighttime construction work*. MM NOI-2 would require Metro's contractor to use cast-in-drill hole (CIDH) or drilled piles rather than impact pile drivers *where necessary to meet construction noise performance criteria established in the construction noise control plan and construction monitoring plan*~~except where these are impracticable to reduce excessive noise~~. MM NOI-3 would require the construction contractor to erect temporary noise barriers between noisy activities and noise sensitive receptors to ensure compliance with applicable noise limits. Noise barriers block the direct path of sound waves and would reduce noise impacts from receptors when applied. MM NOI-4 would require Metro's contractor to locate construction equipment and material staging areas away from sensitive receptors where practicable to increase the distance between receptors and noise generating construction equipment/material staging areas. MM NOI-5 would require construction traffic and haul route routing in areas without noise-sensitive receptors where practicable, thereby minimizing traffic noise. MM NOI-6 would require contractors to use best available control technologies (e.g., piling noise shrouds) to limit excessive noise when working near residences where practicable to muffle sounds created by Project-related construction equipment and therefore reduce noise levels. ~~MM NOI-7 would require the contractor wherever practicable, to conduct construction activities during the daytime and during weekdays in residential areas, since noise is more disruptive at night and weekends when residents are more likely to be home.~~

MM NOI-8 would require Metro to establish a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues arising from construction activities.

~~MM NOI-9 and MM NOI-10, identified in **Section 3.11.7.2**, would require using a muck removal conveyor for the TBM if practicable, with specifications to reduce noise generation, including using temporary tunnel track with smooth rail and wheels, limiting car speeds and removing the muck by truck during the day where the haul route impacts residences.~~ Implementation of MM NOI-9 and MM NOI-10 would lessen noise associated with *spoil* ~~muck~~ removal *where necessary* and minimize ~~nighttime~~ *residential* noise impacts. MM NOI-11 as discussed in ~~in~~ **Section 3.11.7.2** would reduce impacts from ventilation fans by requiring that they be placed away from sensitive receptors, thereby Increasing distance between sensitive receptors and noise generating ventilation fans.

Page 3.11-28. The final paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.1.2** Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce /Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

Additionally, MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11 summarized in **Section 3.11.6.1.1** and identified in Section 3.11.7.2 would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Page 3.11-30. The second paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.1.3** Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

Additionally, MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11 summarized in **Section 3.11.6.1.1** and identified in Section 3.11.7.2 would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Page 3.11-32. The second paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.1.4** Maintenance and Storage Facilities, Subsection Construction Impacts, Montebello MSF and Montebello MSF At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

Additionally, MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11 summarized in Section 3.11.6.1.1 and identified in Section 3.11.7.2 would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Page 3.11-34. The final paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Passby Impacts from LRT Vehicles, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity:

MM NOI-12, identified in **Section 3.11.7.2**, would require the use of track support systems that incorporate resilience, such as ballast mats, high resilience track fasteners, resiliently supported ties or floating track slabs, *as necessary to be below FTA criteria for frequent annoyance from operational vibration. This mitigation* ~~which~~ would reduce vibratory impacts caused by steel wheels rolling over steel rails at rail joints during the passby of LRT vehicles at residences. Implementation of MM NOI-13 would reduce vibration impacts from gaps at switches by requiring *methods such as* installation of ballast mats under conventional switches or using a *monoblock* ~~"gapless" spring~~ frog or other low vibration switches, which would reduce the width of gaps at joints when steel wheels roll over steel rails at rail joints. *A monoblock frog is designed without bolted joints and rails which results in a smoother running surface compared with traditional frogs.* Implementation of MM NOI-12 and MM NOI-13 would reduce operational vibration impacts from passbys to less than significant.

Page 3.11-38 – Page 3.11-39. The seventh and eighth paragraphs of **Section 3.11.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, are hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity and terminology:

MM NOI-2 would require Metro's contractor to use CIDH or drilled piles rather than impact pile drivers to reduce excessive vibration, *where necessary to meet performance criteria* ~~except where these are impracticable~~, because pre-drilling reduces noise and vibration impacts by reducing the rate of displacement and compression of the surrounding soil. MM NOI-4 would require Metro's contractor to locate construction equipment and material staging areas away from sensitive receptors to increase distance in relation to sensitive receptors and thereby reduce impacts. MM NOI-5 would require Metro's contractor to route construction traffic, and haul routes away from sensitive receptors where practicable to reduce vibratory impacts related to haul routes. ~~MM NOI-7 would require the contractor wherever practicable, to conduct construction activities during the daytime and weekdays to reduce nighttime and weekend disruption when residents are more likely to be home.~~ MM NOI-8 would require Metro to establish a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve vibration issues. MM NOI-9 would require using a *spoil* ~~muck~~ removal conveyor for the TBM *where necessary* ~~if practicable, with specifications~~ to reduce vibration, including using temporary tunnel track with smooth rail and wheels.

MM NOI-14 would require Metro to *identify* ~~conduct a survey of selected~~ properties *that may be susceptible to vibration damage* within 100 feet of the alignment to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition of walls and joints to provide a basis for comparison after construction is completed and to provide baseline data for monitoring vibration impacts and developing the construction vibration control plan and monitoring plan described in MM NOI-15. Under MM NOI-15, Metro would require the contractor to develop a construction vibration control plan and a construction vibration monitoring plan to minimize vibration impact and reduce the risk of damage to susceptible structures.

Page 3.11-43. The final paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.2.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce /Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency:

MM NOI-2, MM NOI-4, MM NOI-5, MM NOI-7, MM NOI-8, MM NOI-9, MM NOI-14, and MM NOI-15 would reduce vibration effects through means such as requiring use of equipment that produces less vibration, maximizing the distance between vibration generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, establishing *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve vibration issues, *identifying properties that may be susceptible to*

vibration damage ~~surveying properties to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition~~, and developing a construction vibration control plan and monitoring plan.

Page 3.11-47. The final paragraph of **Section 3.11.6.2.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows for consistency:

MM NOI-2, MM NOI-4, MM NOI-5, MM NOI-7, MM NOI-8, MM NOI-9, MM NOI-14, and MM NOI-15 would reduce vibration effects through means such as requiring use of equipment that produces less vibration, maximizing the distance between vibration generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, establishing *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve vibration issues, *identifying properties that may be susceptible to vibration damage* ~~surveying properties to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition~~, and developing a construction vibration control plan and monitoring plan.

Page 3.11-48. PM NOI-1 in **Section 3.11.7.1**, Project Measures, is hereby revised as follows for clarification and based on project design advancement. Additionally, PM NOI-2 is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

PM NOI-1: Operational (post-Project) design standards for the Build Alternative may include but are not limited to:

- Design ~~efforts~~ per Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) to reduce operational noise of the TPSSs which would mandate the location of traction power substations (TPSS) to be 45 dBA at 50 feet or at the setback line of the nearest building or occupied area, whichever is closer ~~(Metro 2018)~~.

PM NOI-2: Construction activities shall comply with Metro's baseline specifications Section 01_56_19, Construction Noise and Vibration Control. Although Metro, as a state-chartered transportation agency, is exempt from local noise ordinances, the agency is committed to consistency with local construction noise limits whenever feasible and reasonable in accordance with its own construction specifications. Metro's contractor shall utilize control measures from Metro's specifications that effectively minimize noise and vibration impacts in the community. Some mitigation measures shown in **Section 3.11.7.2** are based on the provisions set forth in Section 01_56_19 and are refined to have more specificity towards the Project-related impacts concerning noise and vibration. Under PM NOI-2, the Project shall comply with the entirety of Metro's baseline specifications Section 01_56_19 and Metro's contractor would utilize control measures from its own specifications that effectively minimize noise and vibration impacts in the community, such as:

- Conducting *at-grade* construction activities *adjacent to residential neighborhoods* during the daytime whenever practicable.

Page 3.11-49 – 3.11-50. MM NOI-1, MM NOI-2, MM NOI-7, MM NOI-9, MM NOI-10, MM NOI-12, and MM NOI-14 in **Section 3.11.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, are hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity. Additionally, MM NOI-3, MM NOI-8, and

MM NOI-13 are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and for clarification:

MM NOI-1: Metro shall require the Contractor to develop a construction noise control plan and a construction noise monitoring plan to minimize noise impacts. The construction noise plan shall include construction noise performance criteria. *At a minimum, the*~~The~~ performance criteria *shall prohibit* ~~may not exceed the FTA general assessment~~ construction noise *from exceeding the FTA general assessment construction noise* criteria of 80 dBA for nighttime work and 90 dBA for daytime work at residential properties, or 100 dBA at commercial or industrial properties for daytime or nighttime work.~~, as~~ *These criteria shall be* measured at the boundary of any occupied property where the noise is being received.

MM NOI-2: Metro shall require the Contractor to use construction methods that avoid pile-driving at locations containing noise- and vibration-sensitive receptors, such as residences, schools, and hospitals where practicable. Metro's Contractor shall use cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) or drilled piles rather than impact pile drivers *if necessary* to *meet construction noise performance criteria established in the construction noise control plan and construction noise monitoring plan*~~reduce excessive noise, except where CIDH or drilled piles are impracticable~~.

MM NOI-3: Metro shall require the Contractor to erect temporary noise barriers between noisy activities and noise sensitive receptors *as necessary* to ensure compliance with applicable *construction* noise *performance criteria as specified in the construction noise monitoring plan developed under MM NOI-1* ~~limits~~. *During construction, Metro shall perform audits to monitor the effectiveness of the noise barriers.*

MM NOI-7: *(MM NOI-1 has been revised to clarify that FTA general construction noise criteria for nighttime construction work shall not be exceeded).* ~~Metro shall require the Contractor wherever practicable, to conduct construction activities during the daytime and during weekdays in residential areas.~~

MM NOI-8: Metro shall notify the public, *including schools,* of construction operations and schedules. Metro shall provide a construction-alert publication and set up a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline that shall reply to complaints within 2 working days.

MM NOI-9: Metro shall require the Contractor to *comply with FTA goundborne noise and vibration criteria confirmed in the construction noise monitoring plan for tunnel construction, including spoil removal and transport of segmental tunnel lining. This shall include, where necessary, methods such as installation of* ~~use a muck removal conveyor for the TBM unless otherwise impracticable. If a~~ temporary tunnel track *with* ~~is installed it shall have~~ smooth rail and wheels, and*/or* car speeds *that* ~~shall be limited to~~ limit structure-borne noise and vibration*, or use of spoil removal conveyor*.

MM NOI-10: Metro shall require the Contractor to *not stage trucks in residential areas*~~store muck on site overnight where feasible and remove by truck through the day where the haul route traverses residential areas at night~~.

MM NOI-12: Within the tunnel, Metro shall reduce operational vibration impacts through use of track support systems which incorporate resilience, such as ballast mats, high resilience track fasteners, resiliently supported ties or floating track slabs *as necessary to be below FTA criteria for frequent annoyance from operational vibration. FTA criteria for frequent annoyance is an exceedance of 72 vibration decibels (VdB) at residential uses and 75 VdB at daytime institutional uses, including schools, for more than 70 events per day*.

MM NOI-13: Metro shall reduce vibration impacts *where necessary to be below FTA criteria for frequent annoyance* due to gaps at switches by *methods such as* installing ballast mats *or other resilient fixings* under conventional switches to "decouple" the train vibration from the track supporting structure or using a *monoblock* ~~"gapless" spring~~ frog or other low vibration switches ~~for the entire alignment~~. *FTA criteria for frequent annoyance from operational vibration is an exceedance of 72 vibration decibels (VdB) at residential uses and 75 VdB at daytime institutional uses including schools for more than 70 events per day*.

MM NOI-14: Metro shall *identify selected* ~~conduct a survey of selected~~ properties *that may be susceptible to vibration damage* within 100 feet of the alignment to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition of walls and joints~~. These surveys shall include the installation of strain gauges or a~~ *using methods such as* photographic documentation of the interior walls and/or exterior façade as a basis for comparison after construction is completed.

3.2.13 Section 3.12 Population and Housing

Page 3.12-6. **Section 3.12.5**, Existing Setting, **Table 3.12-4**, General Demographic Characteristics of Census Tracts within 0.5 Miles of Stations, is hereby revised as follows to provide more information on ethnicity in response to public comments:

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[1]	49,122	41%
Two or more races[2]	2,476	2%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)[3]	106,823	~~N/A~~ 89%
Not Hispanic or Latino (Some other race)	7,277	6%
Not Hispanic or Latino (White alone)	5,659	5%
Minority[4]	114,100	95%
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.

Notes:

1 Includes responses in the 2019 U.S. Census for "Black or African American," "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Asian," and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" race categories listed in the rows above. Also respondents providing write-in entries such as multiracial, mixed, or interracial in the "Some Other Race" write-in space are included in this category.

2 Includes those people who chose to provide two or more races on the U.S. Census by selecting two or more race response check boxes. There are 57 possible combinations involving the race categories (Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and/or Some Other Race).

3 Includes Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Other Hispanic or Latino groups.

4 Includes the sum of Hispanic or Latino (of any race) and Not Hispanic or Latino (Some other races).

3.2.14 Section 3.13 Public Services and Recreation

Page 3.13-7. **Section 3.13.5.2** Schools, **Table 3.13-3** Schools within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives, is hereby revised to include the following additions in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Table 3.13-3. Schools within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives

Map ID	School Type	Name	Address	City
16	Public Elementary	*4th Street* ~~Fourth~~ Street	420 South Amalia Ave	Los Angeles
17	Public Elementary	Ada S. Nelson	8140 South Vicki Dr	Whittier
18	Public Elementary	Greenwood	900 South Greenwood Ave	Montebello
19	Public Elementary	George Washington	7804 S. Thornlake Ave	Whittier
20	Public Middle	David Wark Griffith	4765 East Fourth St	Los Angeles
21	Public High	Monterey Continuation	466 South Fraser St	Los Angeles
22	Public High	James A. Garfield Senior	5101 East Sixth St	Los Angeles
23	Public High	Pioneer	10800 Benavon St	Whittier
24	Public Charter	KIPP Raices Academy	668 Atlantic Blvd	Los Angeles
25	Public Charter	KIPP Promesa Prep	5156 Whittier Blvd	Los Angeles
26	Public Charter	Arts in Action Elementary	5115 Via Corona St	Los Angeles
27	Private	Calvary Chapel Christian Academy	931 South Maple Ave	Montebello
28	Private	St. Alphonsus School	552 South Amalia Ave	Los Angeles
	Public Elementary	*4th Street Primary Center*	*469 Amalia Avenue*	*Los Angeles*
	Public Charter High School	*Esperanza College Prep*	*414 S. Atlantic Blvd.*	*Los Angeles*

Page 3.13-8. **Section 3.13.5.4**, Parks and Recreational Facilities, and **Table 3.13-5**, Parks and Recreational Facilities within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives, are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from the Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR):

> **Table 3.13-5** identifies the parks and recreational facilities within one quarter mile of the Build Alternatives and **Figure 3.13.1** shows their locations. Parks and recreational facilities in closest proximity to the Project are Atlantic Avenue Park on Atlantic Boulevard, Chet Holifield Park on Greenwood Avenue, and the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds and ~~bike~~ *multi-use (i.e., hiking, biking, and horseback riding)* trails.

Table 3.13-5. Parks and Recreational Facilities within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives

Map ID	Name	Address	City
32	Chet Holifield Park and Community Center	1060 S. Greenwood Ave	Montebello
33	Woods Avenue Park	Verona St. and Woods Ave	Los Angeles
34	Atlantic Avenue Park	570 South Atlantic Blvd	Los Angeles
35	Belvedere Park Lake	3rd St and La Verne Ave	Los Angeles
36	Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds and ~~Bike~~ *Multi-Use* Trails	Not available	Pico Rivera
37	San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds and ~~Bike~~ *Multi-Use* Trails	Not available	Pico Rivera
38	Whittier Greenway Trail	Not available	Whittier

Page 3.13-9. The last paragraph on page 3.13-9 in **Section 3.13.6.1.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Fire and Police Protection is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from the city of Pico Rivera and to update Metro operational information:

> Security issues, such as fare evasion, assault or robbery, could potentially occur at stations. As standard operating practice and as set forth in PM PSR-1, Metro shall supplement existing police protection services by providing Transit Services Bureau officers and contracted police services at all new LRT facilities, as needed to ensure that adequate police protection services are provided. ~~In the fall of 2022,~~ *Beginning in October 2022,* Metro *has begun deploying* ~~would launch a three-year pilot transit ambassador program which would deploy~~ trained contract personnel on Metro's buses, bus stops, trains, and stations *to provide customer support*. Ambassadors ~~would be~~ *are* unarmed and travel the system or ~~be~~ *are present* at fixed stations to promote safety for riders and operators. *While not acting as security officers or replacing security officers, they provide a visible presence and support riders by connecting them with resources they may need such as providing directions or connecting them to services available through Metro's homeless outreach teams. They also help Metro to respond to issues more quickly by reporting maintenance, cleanliness, or safety concerns directly to the appropriate Metro department (Metro 2023).* ~~The primary role of the transit ambassador program is to be a visible presence (Metro, 2022).~~

Page 3.13-10. The second paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

> As identified in **Section 3.13.5.2**, there are several schools located adjacent to Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not result in the need for new or physically altered schools. No physical alterations to *Griffith Middle School,* Garfield High School*,* ~~or Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School*, 4th Street Primary Center, or Esperanza College Prep* would be required for the schools to continue operating or to maintain school access because the LRT guideway would operate below the ROW of Atlantic Boulevard, and the schools would not be impacted.

Page 3.13-11. The third paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Parks and Recreational Facilities, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Operation of Alternative 1 would not result in impacts to parks. There would be no acquisitions or reduction of access to parks that could require alteration or new construction of parks and recreational facilities in order to maintain park and recreation services. No physical alterations or impacts to Atlantic Avenue Park would occur because the LRT guideway would be underground. Chet Holifield Park is proximate to the ~~aerial~~ Greenwood station. Although the proposed station would provide additional access to the park, attendance is not likely to increase since this is a neighborhood-scale park that is unlikely to attract visitors from beyond the immediate vicinity. Similarly, the use of both the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Ground and associated ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails would not be affected, and trail use is not anticipated to notably increase. *The finish grade of the rail bridge crossings of the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River would maintain or increase clearance compared to the existing conditions. Therefore, no decrease in the clearance heights would occur that could restrict use of the multi-use trail crossings beneath the bridges.*

Page 3.13-14. The second paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Alternative 1 would not require any physical alterations at nearby schools including: Griffith Middle School, Garfield High School, ~~Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, Esperanza College Prep,* Greenwood Elementary School, Ada S. Nelson Elementary School, and Washington Elementary School to accommodate an increased population or construction activities.

Page 3.13-14. The second paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, Parks and Recreational facilities, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Bridge replacement at the Rio Hondo and the San Gabriel River may inhibit access or require temporary closure of their respective ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails. ~~A short, t~~*T*emporary re-routing of the ~~bike~~ trail around the construction area would allow it to remain open continuously. The re-routing would not require substantial physical alterations or construction and would be accomplished *primarily* with signage and ground markings. While access to the ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails would be limited in the vicinity of the bridges while construction is occurring, access to other portions of the trail would be maintained uninterrupted during construction. As identified in PM TRA-2, identified in **Section 3.14**, Transportation and Traffic, Metro standard practices shall include timing closures to minimize disruptions *to the public* and developing a Traffic Management Plan for construction activities *affecting* ~~for~~ parks and recreational facilities. *Development of a Traffic Management Plan will include coordination with affected jurisdictions along the route, which would include, but not be limited to, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.* Detours would ~~be provided to~~ provide safe access around the construction areas, and access to the ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails and other parks and recreational facilities would remain available; there would be no need for new or physically altered parks and recreation, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service levels. Therefore, construction of Alternative 1 would have less than significant impacts on parks and recreational facilities.

Page 3.13-16. The second paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.2** Alternative 2 Atlantic to Citadel IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

No physical alterations to *Griffith Middle School*, Garfield High School~~, or Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School*, 4th Street Primary Center, or Esperanza College Prep* would be required to continue operating or maintain school access.

Page 3.13-16 – Page 3.13-17. The last paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.2** Alternative 2 Atlantic to Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Since the construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would primarily take place underground, no physical alterations would occur at nearby schools and parks and recreational facilities, including Griffith Middle School, Garfield High School, ~~Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, Esperanza College Prep,* Atlantic Avenue Park, or Belvedere Park Lake.

Page 3.13-18. The last paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Since the construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or Montebello At-Grade Option would primarily take place underground, no physical alterations would occur at nearby schools and parks and recreational facilities, including Griffith Middle School, Garfield High School, ~~Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, Esperanza College Prep,* Greenwood Elementary School, Atlantic Avenue Park, Belvedere Park Lake, and Chet Holifield Park and Library.

Page 3.13-20. The second paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

There is the potential for an indirect impact given that new transit stations would be constructed in areas near parks and recreational facilities which would enable transit riders to visit these facilities, such as Chet Holifield Park which is located near the Greenwood station, and the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds and associated ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails located in the vicinity of Norwalk station.

Page 3.13-21. The first paragraph in **Section 3.13.6.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Construction of Alternative 1 would not require the physical acquisition, displacement, or relocation of parks or other recreational facilities. Construction activities associated with Alternative 1 could result in temporary nuisances associated with intermittent increases in noise, dust, odors, and traffic delays, which could affect the use and physical quality of adjacent parks and recreational facilities, including Chet Holifield Park, the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds, and associated ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails. As discussed in **Section 3.2** Air Quality, **Section 3.11** Noise and Vibration, and **Section 3.14** Transportation, however, these impacts would be less than significant with implementation of standard control measures. Further, these impacts would not lead to increased use of parks or other recreational facilities. Construction activities would likely require intermittent sidewalk and lane closures and detours which could inhibit access to recreational facilities. The reconstruction of the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River bridges may require temporary closure or re-routing of the ~~bike~~*multi-use* trails. As identified in PM TRA-2, Metro standard practices include timing closures to minimize disruptions *to the public* and developing a Traffic

Management Plan for construction activities as discussed in **Section 3.14**, Transportation and Traffic, and Appendix N. *Development of a Traffic Management Plan will include coordination with affected jurisdictions along the route, which would include, but not be limited to, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.* Thus, access to parks and recreational facilities would be maintained during construction.

Page 3.13-26. in **Section 3.13.7.1** is hereby revised as follows for clarification:

PM PSR-1: Operational ~~(post-Project)~~ BMPs for the Build Alternatives may include (but would not be limited to):

- *The contractor*~~Metro~~ shall coordinate with fire and police protection officials when designing grade crossings to ensure that access for police and fire protection services is maintained. *Metro shall be included in all correspondence with third parties.*

3.2.15 Section 3.14 Transportation and Traffic

Page 3.14-26. The first paragraph on Page 3.14-26 in **Section 3.14.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

As set forth in PM TRA-2 (**Section 3.14.7.1**), cooperation with the corridor cities *and the County* would occur throughout the construction process and restrictions on haul routes can be incorporated into the construction specifications according to local permitting requirements.

Page 3.14-34. The first paragraph in **Section 3.14.6.3.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

Alternative 1 uses the existing street alignment and ROW for at-grade or aerial segments, and would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature. Alternative 1 would be designed, constructed, and operated per applicable State, Metro, and city design criteria and standards, including adherence to design codes and standards such as the *California Division of* Occupational Safety and Health Administration (*Cal/*OSHA), ~~California OSHA,~~ California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), and Metro safety and security programs and standards (i.e., MRDC and Metro Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy).

Page 3.14-35. **Section 3.14.6.3.1** Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR and Metro standard procedures:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 3.14-37. **Section 3.14.6.3.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR and Metro standard procedures:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 3.14-38. **Section 3.14.6.3.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Options, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR and Metro standard procedures:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 3.14-39. **Section 3.14.6.3.4**, Maintenance and Storage Facilities, Subsection Construction Impacts, MSF Site Options and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR and Metro standard procedures:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 3.14-44. **Section 3.14.6.4.4** Maintenance and Storage Facilities, Subsection Operational Impacts, MSF Site Options and Design Option is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

As set forth in PM TRA-3, any roadway changes would be designed according to applicable MRDC, *state, and local design criteria and standards where applicable* including *fire code and* Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria and standards, and would provide adequate emergency access.

Page 3.14-46. The first bullet on Page 3.14-46 for PM TRA-1 in **Section 3.14.7.1**, Project Measures, are hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

PM TRA-1: Operational BMPs for the Build Alternatives shall include the following:

- The Project shall be operated per applicable State, Metro, and city design criteria and standards, including adherence to design codes and standards such as the *California Division of* Occupational Safety and Health Administration (*Cal/*OSHA), ~~California OSHA,~~ California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), and Metro safety and security programs and standards (i.e., MRDC and Metro Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy), to ensure emergency vehicle access and building standards ensure that response times are maintained and at acceptable levels.

Pages 3.14-46 – 3.14.47. The following bullets for PM TRA-2 in **Section 3.14.7.1**, Project Measures, are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR and to improve clarity:

PM TRA-2: Construction BMPs for the Build Alternatives shall include the following:

- Cooperation with the corridor cities *and the County* shall occur throughout the construction process. Restrictions on haul routes may be incorporated into the construction specifications according to local permitting requirements.
- Construction activities shall comply with *California Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA)* ~~OSHA, California OSHA~~ and Metro safety and security programs.
- Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists shall be maintained during construction*; methods may include*~~using~~ signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.
- Lane and/or road closures shall be scheduled to minimize disruptions, including detour routes, in coordination with *authorities having jurisdiction and* local fire and police departments prior to construction. The nearest local first responders shall be notified, as appropriate, of traffic control measures in the *Traffic Management Plan (see MM TRA-1)*~~plan~~ during construction to coordinate emergency response routing.
- The Project shall be designed and constructed per applicable State, Metro, and city design criteria and standards, including adherence to design codes and standards such as the ~~Occupational Safety and Health Administration (~~*Cal/*OSHA~~), California OSHA~~, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), and Metro safety and security programs and standards (i.e., MRDC and Metro Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy).

Page 3.14-47. The second and third bullets for PM TRA-3 in **Section 3.14.7.1**, Project Measures, are hereby revised as follows based on the advancement of Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 with the Montebello MSF in the Final EIR and to improve clarity:

PM TRA-3 Operational BMPs for the MSF ~~Site Options~~ include the following:

- Minor changes to traffic circulation, such as new or modified driveways ~~and the closure of a portion of Corvette Street (between Saybrook Avenue and Davie Avenue) for the Commerce MSF site option~~ shall be designed according to applicable State, Metro, and city design criteria and standards.
- Any roadway changes shall be designed according to applicable MRDC, *state, and local design criteria and standards where applicable,* including *fire code and* Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria and standards, and shall provide adequate emergency access.

Page 3.14-47. PM TRA-4 in **Section 3.14.7.1**, Project Measures, is hereby revised as follows based on the advancement of Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 with the Montebello MSF in the Final EIR and to improve clarity:

PM TRA-4 Construction BMPs for the MSF ~~Site Options~~ (must include but not be limited to):

- Access to nearby properties shall be maintained throughout the course of construction, and alternative routes shall be available for any streets requiring a full closure (e.g., ~~use of Corvette Street would be routed to Fleet Street for the Commerce MSF site option, or Gayhart Street, and~~ use of Acco Street shall be routed to Flotilla Street or Washington Boulevard for the Montebello MSF~~ site option and Montebello MSF At-Grade Option~~).

Pages 3.14-48 – 3.14-49. MM TRA-1 in **Section 3.14.7.2**, Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and clarifications:

MM TRA-1 *The contractor*~~Metro~~ shall prepare a Traffic Management Plan as needed to facilitate the flow of traffic in and around construction zones. The Traffic Management Plan shall include, at minimum, the following measures:

- *Where feasible,* ~~s~~Schedule ~~a majority of~~ construction-related travel (i.e., deliveries~~, hauling, and worker trips~~) during off-peak hours~~,~~ and~~, where feasible,~~ maintain two-way traffic circulation along affected roadways during peak hours.

- Designated routes for project haul trucks shall be located along the Project corridor ROW and/or major streets connecting to construction staging areas and the nearest freeways (e.g., SR-60, I-5, and I-605). Major streets may include Atlantic Boulevard, Saybrook Avenue, Telegraph Road, Washington Boulevard, Paramount Boulevard, Rosemead Boulevard, Slauson Avenue, and Whittier Boulevard. In cooperation with the jurisdictions along the alignment and implemented throughout the construction process, these routes shall be consistent with local land use and mobility plans and situated to minimize noise, vibration, and other possible impacts.

- *Contractors shall maintain safe and convenient pedestrian routes to school by ensuring project haul routes and construction traffic, to the greatest extent possible, avoid any published school pedestrian routes.*

- Develop detour routes to facilitate traffic movement through construction zones without significantly increasing cut-through-traffic in adjacent residential areas.

- Develop and implement an outreach program and public awareness campaign in coordination with transit agencies to inform the general public about the construction process and planned roadway closures, potential impacts, and mitigation measures, including temporary bus stop relocation.

- Develop and implement a program with business owners to minimize effects to businesses during construction activity, including but not limited to signage programs and identification of detours (particularly for truck access).

- Where feasible, temporarily restripe roadways to maximize the vehicular capacity at locations affected by construction closures.

- Where feasible, temporarily remove on-street parking to maximize the vehicular capacity at locations affected by construction closures.

- ~~Where feasible, station traffic~~*Traffic* control officers at major intersections during peak hours *shall be provided as required by the Traffic Management Plan and Worksite Traffic Control Plans if* ~~to minimize~~ delays *are* related to construction activities.

- Provide wayfinding signage, lighting and access to specify pedestrian safety amenities (such as handrails, fences, and alternative walkways) during construction.

- Where construction encroaches on sidewalks, walkways, ~~and~~ crosswalks, *and multi-use trails,* special pedestrian safety measures shall be used, such as detour routes and temporary pedestrian shelters.

- Provide ~~on-street bicycle~~detour routes and signage to address temporary effects to *multi-use trails and* bicycle circulation, and minimize inconvenience (e.g., lengthy detours) as to minimize users potentially choosing ~~fewer~~ *less* safe routes if substantially rerouted.

- *Regular communication with school administrators shall be maintained to ensure sufficient notice of construction activities and/or detours, that could affect pedestrian routes to schools is provided.*

- *Construction flaggers shall be implemented any time a construction ingress or egress is located within 200 feet of a schools' student entrance during school hours.*

- *Metro's construction outreach efforts shall include reaching out to local school district administrators to provide advanced information regarding construction activities and/or detours if construction activities will affect bus routes and stops to schools.*

- *Access to adjacent businesses and schools (including access to passenger loading areas for student drop-offs at schools) shall be provided via existing or temporary driveways or loading zones during business and school hours throughout the construction period.*

3.2.16 Section 3.15 Tribal Cultural Resources

Page 3.15-7. The last paragraph of **Section 3.15.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> MM TCR-3 requires *the contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare* a project–wide Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) *to be implemented during construction* ~~to be developed and implemented by Metro~~. This document would address areas where potentially significant prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits and TCRs are likely to be located within the ADI based on background research, a geoarchaeological analysis, and Tribal consultation.

Page 3.15-16 – Page 3.15-17. The following mitigation measure (MM TCR-3) in **Section 3.15.7.2** Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and design and to improve clarity:

MM TCR-3 **Unknown Tribal Cultural Resources.** *The contractor shall retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare a project-wide Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) that shall be implemented during construction*~~A project-wide Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) shall be developed and implemented by Metro~~. This document shall address areas where potentially significant prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits, and Tribal Cultural Resources are likely to be located within the *Area of Direct Impact (ADI)*~~ADI~~ based on background research, a geoarchaeological analysis, and Tribal consultation. The CRMMP shall encompass both archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources and shall be kept confidential. Preparation of the CRMMP shall necessitate the completion of pedestrian survey of the private property parcels in the ADI that were not accessible during the preparation of this Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 EIR.

The CRMMP shall include a detailed prehistoric and historic context that clearly demonstrates the themes under which any identified resources would be determined significant. Should significant deposits be identified during earth-moving activities, where feasible, the CRMMP shall address methods for data recovery, anticipated artifact types, artifact analysis, report writing, repatriation of human remains and associated grave goods, and curation or other methods of disposition in consultation with the Tribe.

The CRMMP shall also require that an archaeologist qualified in prehistoric and historical archaeology and a Native American monitor who is both approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government and is listed under the *Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)'s*~~NAHC's~~ Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location be retained prior to ground-disturbing activities. The CRMMP shall be a guide for monitoring activities. If buried Tribal Cultural Resources or cultural resources, such as flaked or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or non-human bone, are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within 50 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures. If resources are Native

American in origin and may also be Tribal Cultural Resources, treatment and curation of these resources shall be determined in consultation with the Tribe. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation.

3.2.17 Section 3.16 Utilities and Service Systems

Page 3.16-14. **Section 3.16.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and design and to improve clarity:

> Construction of Alternative 1 would require relocating, temporarily rerouting, protecting in place or otherwise avoiding some utility supply lines or other facilities. The construction impacts of utility work (e.g., temporary disruption of service) would be localized, occurring generally at or near street intersections and have been evaluated as part of the Project in context with other physical effects on the environment in this EIR. During the Final Design phase, the Project team would coordinate with utility companies to request information, identify conflict locations between construction activities and existing facilities, and determine if relocation would be required or if utility lines could be protected in-place. Most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place with sleeve casing or other methods consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria. *Utility relocation work will generally occur within the affected ROW and on adjacent and nearby streets.* Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities.

Page 3.16-17 – Page 3.16-18. **Section 3.16.6.1.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternatives and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and design and to improve clarity:

> Construction of the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station would require relocating, temporarily rerouting, or otherwise avoiding some utility supply lines or other facilities. The construction impacts of utility work (e.g., temporary disruption of service) would be localized, occurring generally at or near street intersections and have been evaluated as part of the Project in context with other physical effects on the environment in this EIR. During the Final Design phase, the Project team would coordinate with utility companies to request information, identify conflict locations between construction activities and existing facilities, and determine if relocation would be required or if equipment could be protected in-place. Most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place with sleeve casing or other methods consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria. *Utility relocation work will generally occur within the affected ROW and on adjacent and nearby streets.* Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities.

Page 3.16-21. **Section 3.16.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Construction Impacts, Base Alternatives and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and design and to improve clarity:

> Construction of the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option would require relocating, temporarily rerouting, or otherwise avoiding some utility supply lines or other facilities. The construction impacts of utility work (e.g., temporary disruption of service) would be localized, occurring generally at or near street

intersections and have been evaluated as part of the Project in context with other physical effects on the environment in this EIR. During the Final Design phase, the Project team would coordinate with utility companies to request information, identify conflict locations between construction activities and existing facilities, and determine if relocation would be required or if equipment could be protected in-place. Most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place with sleeve casing or other methods consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria. *Utility relocation work will generally occur within the affected ROW and on adjacent and nearby streets.* Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities.

3.2.18 Section 3.17 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Pages 3.17-9 – 3.17-10. **Section 3.17.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

While housing development would not be directly induced by the Project, there would be opportunities where Alternative 1 could serve as a "catalyst" for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix K identify *that there may be* opportunities within the DSA for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment at properties proposed to be acquired for the Project. These are summarized briefly here by station and are presented in greater detail in Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix K.

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured):** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the East Los Angeles County Community Plan land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby**.**

- **Whittier:** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the East Los Angeles County Community Plan land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, a gas station, and miscellaneous services. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, there *may* exist~~s~~ potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Lambert:** Potential development would be limited to development of existing commercial and vacant parcels. The city of Whittier's land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations would limit the intensity of redevelopment. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed Lambert station are commercial uses. Any opportunities for development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies and regulations, including the *2021-2040 Envision Whittier General Plan*. With

approximately 20 percent of the neighborhood surrounding the proposed station being currently residential, there *may be* ~~is~~ opportunity for joint-use development.

Page 3.17-11. **Section 3.17.6.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised to improve clarity:

Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

Page 3.17-13. **Section 3.17.6.1.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments:

While housing development would not be directly induced by the project, there would be opportunities where the base Alternative 2 or Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option could serve as a "catalyst" for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix K identify *that there may be* opportunities within the DSA for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment. These are summarized briefly here by station and are presented in greater detail in Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix K.

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured) -** applies to the base Alternative 2: Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Whittier** – applies to the base Alternative 2 and Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option: Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, a gas station, and miscellaneous services. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, there *may* exist~~s~~ potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

Page 3.17-15. **Section 3.17.6.1.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, Subsection Operational Impacts, Base Alternative and Design Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

While development would not be induced, there are opportunities where the base Alternative 3 or Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option could serve as a "catalyst" for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix K identify *that there may be* ~~many~~ opportunities within the DSA for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment. These are summarized briefly here by station and are presented in greater detail in Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, and Appendix K.

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured)** – applies to the base Alternative 3: Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Whittier** – applies to the base Alternative 3 and Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and/or the Montebello At-Grade Option: Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, a gas station, and miscellaneous services. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics, plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, there *may* exist~~s~~ potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

3.2.19 Section 3.18 Cumulative

Page 3.18-14. **Section 3.18.5.3.2** Related Projects, **Table 3.18-2** Related Projects within the DSA by Jurisdiction, is hereby updated as follows to include an additional project:

Table 3.18-2 Related Projects within the DSA by Jurisdiction

Fig. #	Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Description
8	Beverly Crossing Commercial Project- 9036 Beverly Boulevard	Commercial	Pico Rivera	Commercial retail space with that includes approximately 53,960 square feet of neighborhood retail and restaurants. Approved in 2020. Construction timeline is uncertain.
	Washington and Rosemead Boulevards Transit-Oriented Development Specific Plan	*Mixed-use commercial and residential*	*Pico Rivera*	*Plan proposes to rezone approximately 327 acres of land around the future Metro station for new mixed-use commercial and residential development, along with mobility and public realm improvements. The plan area is expected to accommodate more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use commercial development and approximately 31,000 square feet of mixed-use residential development.*
9	Sorensen XC, LLC	Industrial	Santa Fe Springs	Development of a 233,779 square foot concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, which is located at 8201 Sorensen Avenue.

Page 3.18-19. The third paragraph of Section 3.18.6.3, Biological Resources, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> Construction of related land development projects within the DSA, which encompasses the BRSA, and *Alternative 1* ~~Build Alternatives~~ would have the potential to spread invasive species *and tree pathogens if construction occurs in areas of exposed soil and affects vegetation communities*. Considered cumulatively, the potential to spread invasive species *and tree pathogens* from construction *in the rivers and spreading grounds (required for Alternative 1)* ~~of the Build Alternatives~~ and related projects would result in a cumulatively significant impact. However, with incorporation of mitigation measures, *Alternative 1* ~~all Project related~~ impacts under BIO-2 would be reduced to less than significant. The significant impact from the spread of invasive species would not be cumulatively affected by the related plans and projects because it would be reduced by mitigation measures to *prepare an Invasive Plant and Infectious Tree Disease Mitigation Plan and* clean construction equipment and avoid the spread of soil and plant material (MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6); therefore, the Project would not contribute any incremental impact.

Page 3.18-21 – Page 3.18-22. The last sentence of the last paragraph in Section 3.18.6.6, Geology, Seismicity, Soils, and Paleontological Resources is hereby revised to correct a typo:

> Considered cumulatively with the plans and projects identified in **Section 3.18.5**, and even with implementation of MM GEO-1 through *MM GEO-4*~~MM GEO-5~~, as shown in **Table 3.18-3**, there would be a significant cumulative impact. The incremental impact from Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 would be cumulatively considerable.

Page 3.18-29. Section 3.18.7 Mitigation Measures, Table 3.18-3, Summary of Mitigation Measure Applicability, is hereby revised for consistency:

Mitigation Measure	Alternative 1 With Commerce MSF or Montebello MSF Site Option	Alternative 2 With Commerce MSF	Alternative 3 With Commerce MSF or Montebello MSF Site Option
Biological Resources			
MM BIO-1	Applicable	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-2	Applicable	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-3	Applicable	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-4	Applicable	Applicable	Applicable
MM BIO-5	Applicable	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~
MM BIO-6	Applicable	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~

3.2.20 Chapter 9 References

Pages 9-8 and 9-27, and 9-28, **Chapter 9**, are hereby revised to add the following documents that were published after the Recirculated Draft EIR was released:

California State Water Resources Control Board. 2022. Order WQ 2022-0057-DWQ. NPDES No. CAS000002. General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (General Permit). Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction/docs/2022-0057-dwq-with-attachments/cgp2022_order.pdf. Accessed April 27, 2023.

Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). 2022. Los Angeles River Master Plan. Available at: https://pw.lacounty.gov/uploads/swp/LARiverMasterPlan-FINAL-DIGITAL-COMPRESSED.pdf. Accessed June 27, 2023.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2022. LA Metro Tree Policy. Available at: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/x6nir6t3zhxr6b7/AAAk-ubvgrLdpSZ_X1ACqw2Sa?dl=0&preview=2022_LA+Metro+Tree+Policy.pdf. Accessed November 16, 2023.

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2021b. Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Discharges within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/public_docs/2022/1_Order(ACC-RPSignature).pdf. Accessed April 12, 2023.

3.3 Corrections and Additions to the Recirculated Draft EIR – Appendices

3.3.1 Appendix B Visual and Aesthetics

Page 36. The second paragraph of **Section 6.2.2**, Landscape Unit 2 – Smithway Street, Subsection Commerce, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received:

> Ferguson Boulevard is a four-lane collector roadway that runs east to west with two lanes of traffic in both directions and a sidewalk on the south side of the roadway *to the west of Gerhart Avenue*.

Page 36. The third paragraph of **Section 6.2.2**, Landscape Unit 2 – Smithway Street, Subsection Commerce, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the city of Commerce:

> Smithway Street is a two-lane arterial roadway that runs east-west with one lane of traffic in each direction. The roadway ~~is not typically busy and~~ functions as an access road for the north entrance of the Citadel Outlets' parking facilities and for the surrounding industrial buildings.

Page 78. **Figure 7.8**, "Visual Simulation: Washington Boulevard at Greenwood Avenue (At-Grade Option) (Looking east)" is hereby revised as follows to include a new Existing and Conceptual image to show the station consistent with the current Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy. The caption does not need to be updated.


Existing


Conceptual
MONTEBELLO
Visual simulation subject to change based on Metro's current Systemwide Station Design Standard
Not to Scale

3.3.2 Appendix D Biological Resources

Page 18. The end of **Section 3.3.2**, Tree Protection Policies and Municipal Codes, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> Most of the municipalities do not have specific replacement requirements and mitigation is developed on a case by case basis within each jurisdiction. *In addition to these local regulations, Metro recently adopted the LA Metro Tree Policy, which is discussed below.*

Page 22-23. **Section 3.3.2**, Tree Protection Policies and Municipal Codes, is hereby revised to include the following subsection to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> ***3.3.2.7 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority***
>
> *In October 2022, Metro approved the agency's first tree policy to help preserve and grow Los Angeles County's urban tree canopy, which will help protect Metro customers from extreme heat and improve air quality (Metro 2022). The Metro Tree Policy clarifies and standardizes Metro's practices for protecting the urban tree canopy throughout its transit construction program. It also establishes the agency's commitment to a sustainable tree replacement strategy when tree removal is deemed unavoidable to build Metro projects. The policy requires tree replacement (described further below), planting California-native or other drought-tolerant trees, and collaborating with regional partners, local agencies, and communities during the planning and design of capital projects.*
>
> *In accordance with the policy, Metro will plan and design construction projects so that large, healthy trees are preserved to the extent possible. Prior to construction, Metro will prepare a tree protection plan identifying tree protection zones for all trees designated for protection. The plan will protect designated trees from immediate and delayed construction-related damage, such as loss of root area or soil compaction. Metro will also prepare a mitigation plan, in consultation with a Certified Arborist, for damaged trees and trees whose removal cannot be avoided. Street trees removed in association with construction projects will be replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio with 36-inch box trees (i.e., young trees with a large root ball) at or near the removal location. Replacement trees will be California native trees or similar species with low water demand, ability to provide shade, and compatibility with regional efforts to mitigate exposure to high heat. In the case of trees that are designated as heritage or protected trees by local ordinances, all options will be exhausted before such trees are removed. When necessary to remove heritage or protected trees, they will be replaced at a 4:1 ratio by the trees of the same variety. In accordance with the policy, Metro will commit to a 3-year establishment period for any replacement trees.*

Page 36. **Section 6.3**, Special-Status Species, **Table 6-1** is hereby revised to clarify that there is "Very low or no potential to occur" for coastal whiptail and spadefoot toad in response to public comments received from CDFW:

Table 6-1. Special-Status Wildlife and Plant Species Potentially in the BRSA

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status / CNPS Rank	Potential to Occur in the Study Area
AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES			
Coastal whiptail	*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*	CSC	*Very low or no* ~~Low~~ potential to occur. Suitable habitat is very limited within the BRSAs.
Western spadefoot toad	*Spea hammondii*	CSC	*Very low or no* ~~Low~~ potential to occur. Suitable habitat is very limited within the BRSAs.

Page 55. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Maintenance of LRT facilities is not likely to entail removal of vegetation or of cliff swallow nesting habitat at the bridges but could involve tree trimming. Any tree trimming along Alternative 1 during the bird nesting season, which generally runs from January 1 through September 1, would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. Thus, there would be potentially significant impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, which requires nesting bird surveys and avoidance of active nests during the bird nesting season as discussed in **Section 9.1.1** would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 *are* ~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 55. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming along Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. Thus, there would be significant impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized above and discussed in **Section 9.1.1**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are* ~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 56. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming along Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. Thus, there would be significant impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option. I~~implementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized above and discussed in **Section 9.1.1**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 1 with the Montebello At-Grade Option *are* ~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 59. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.2.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming along Alternative 2 during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds~~. ~~I~~implementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 2 *are* ~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 59. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.2.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Option, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> As discussed in Section 6.7 migratory birds could nest in street trees. Any tree trimming along Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds~~. ~~I~~implementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are* ~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 60. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.3.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Maintenance of LRT facilities is not likely to entail removal of vegetation but could involve tree trimming at surface facilities and above-ground portions of the alignment. Any tree trimming during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. I~~implementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 3 *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 61. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.3.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> As discussed in **Section 6.7**, migratory birds could nest in street trees. Any tree trimming during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. I~~implementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 61. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.3.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> As with an aerial crossing in Montebello, under the Montebello At-Grade Option, maintenance could involve tree trimming at surface facilities and above-ground portions of the alignment. As discussed in **Section 6.7**, migratory birds could nest in street trees. Any tree trimming during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds. I~~implementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 63. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.4.1.1**, Commerce MSF is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of the Commerce MSF *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 63. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.4.1.2**, Montebello MSF is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Maintenance is not expected to involve vegetation removal but could involve tree trimming. Any tree trimming during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of the Montebello MSF *are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 64. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.4.1.2**, Montebello MSF, Design Option, Montebello MSF At-Grade Option is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency with Metro standard procedures:

> Any tree trimming during the bird nesting season would *be limited and would primarily affect smaller branches that may be starting to encroach into the transit right-of-way where most birds would be unlikely to nest. Further, maintenance activities would be required to comply with the MBTA, California Fish and Game Code, and other regulations protecting migratory birds. However, in the event that tree trimming is needed during the tree establishment maintenance period,* ~~result in potentially significant impacts on migratory birds.~~ *i*~~I~~mplementation of MM BIO-4, as summarized in **Section 7.1.1.1** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would ensure that bird nests would be avoided ~~during maintenance activities~~. *Compliance with MM BIO-4 and adherence to regulations protecting migratory birds would ensure* ~~Thus, the implementation of MM BIO-4 would reduce~~ impacts on migratory birds from operation of the Montebello MSF *At-Grade Option are*~~to~~ less than significant.

Page 66 – 67. The last paragraph of **Section 7.2.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

Many species of invasive plants were observed in the *rivers and spreading grounds* ~~areas~~ where construction would occur. ~~Along the underground, at-grade, and aerial portions of the alignment~~ *In these areas*, construction equipment would likely be operated within areas of exposed dirt, for activities such as excavation and staging. The possible introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from use of equipment, which could spread invasive plant seeds from one area of exposed soil to another would result in a potentially significant impact on ~~native~~ vegetation communities and habitat. *Further, construction within vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) in the rivers and spreading grounds could spread tree pathogens from one tree to another, resulting in a potentially significant impact.* Implementation of MM BIO-5, which requires the contractor to *prepare an invasive plant and infectious tree disease mitigation plan for work within the rivers and spreading grounds* ~~clean construction vehicles with compressed air or water within a designated containment area,~~ and MM BIO-6, which requires the contractor to wash soil and plant material off all equipment tires and treads before moving to areas of exposed soils *in accordance with the plan*, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds *and tree pathogens* and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.

Page 67. The second paragraphs of **Section 7.2.1.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option are hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

As with the base Alternative 1, there would be a potentially significant impact from the possible introduction or spread of invasive plants *and tree pathogens* from use of construction equipment ~~in areas of exposed soil~~ *within the rivers and spreading grounds*. Implementation of MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6, as summarized in **Section 7.2.1.2** and identified in **Section 9.2.1**, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant.

Page 68. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 2 are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, construction of Alternative 2 would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur underground or in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 2 would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~Many species of invasive plants were observed in the areas where construction would occur. Although the majority of Alternative 2 would be underground, construction equipment would likely be operated within areas of exposed dirt for activities such as excavation and staging. The possible introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Thus, there would be a potentially significant impact from invasive species spread caused by construction of Alternative 2. Implementation of MM BIO-5 and MM BIO-6, as summarized in Section 7.2.1.2 and identified in Section 9.2.2, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant. See Section 9.2.2 for the proposed mitigation and impacts after incorporation of mitigation.~~

Page 69. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.2.2**, Construction Impacts, Design Option, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, construction would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur underground or in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 2 would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~The possible introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Thus, there would be a potentially significant impact from invasive species spread caused by construction of Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option. Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as summarized in Section 7.2.1.2 and identified in Section 9.2.2, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant. See Section 9.2.2 for the proposed mitigation and impacts after incorporation of mitigation.~~

Page 70. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 3 are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, Alternative 3 would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 3 would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~Many species of invasive plants were observed in the areas where construction would occur. Construction equipment would likely be operated within areas of exposed dirt for activities such as excavation and staging. These activities would be required for construction of the at-grade segment, as well as the remainder of Alternative 3. The introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Thus, there would be a potentially significant impact from invasive species spread caused by construction of Alternative 3. Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as summarized in Section 7.2.1.2 and identified in Section 9.2.3, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant. See Section 9.2.3 for the proposed mitigation and impacts after incorporation of mitigation.~~

Page 70. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.3.2**, Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, construction would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~Many species of invasive plants were observed in the areas where construction would occur. Construction equipment would likely be operated within areas of exposed dirt for activities such as excavation and staging. The introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native~~

~~vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Thus, there would be a potentially significant impact from invasive species spread caused by construction of Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option. Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as summarized in Section 7.2.1.2 and identified in Section 9.2.3, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant. See Section 9.2.3 for the proposed mitigation and impacts after incorporation of mitigation.~~

Page 71. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.3.2**, Subsection Construction Impacts, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis:

The majority of areas that could be affected by Alternative 3 with the Montebello At-Grade Option are developed and consist of structures, roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscaped areas. Further, construction would not affect the rivers or spreading grounds where vegetation communities (e.g., trees grouped together to form a canopy) exist. Construction would primarily occur in developed or paved areas and would not affect vegetation communities. Thus, it is unlikely that construction of Alternative 3 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would introduce or spread invasive plants or tree disease pathogens; the impact would be less than significant. ~~Many species of invasive plants were observed in the areas where construction would occur. Construction equipment would likely be operated within areas of exposed dirt for activities such as excavation and staging. The introduction or spread of invasive plants during construction from equipment use would result in a potentially significant impact on native vegetation communities and habitat in surrounding areas. Thus, there would be a potentially significant impact from invasive species spread caused by construction of Alternative 3 with the Montebello At-Grade Option. Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as summarized in Section 7.2.1.2 and identified in Section 9.2.3, would reduce the potential to spread invasive plant seeds and would thus reduce impacts to less than significant. See Section 9.2.3 for the proposed mitigation and impacts after incorporation of mitigation.~~

Page 78. **Section 7.4.1.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

As discussed in **Section 3.3.2**, *Metro has a newly adopted tree policy that requires replacement of any trees to be removed and provides protection for trees designated for retention. In addition,* tree protection policies are in effect in each of the cities within the BRSA. Therefore, trees along the proposed alignment and within proposed stations would be protected by these local policies. No impacts on locally protected trees would occur during operation. If maintenance of LRT facilities entails tree trimming, *the LA Metro Tree Policy as well as* local policies and municipal codes regarding protection of both native trees and street trees would be considered to ensure compliance requirements are met. Thus, Alternative 1 would not conflict with tree protection policies or other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and there would be no impact from operation of Alternative 1.

Page 79. The first paragraph of **Section 7.4.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

A subset of the trees observed within the BRSA would be removed or disturbed during construction. *As noted in **Section 3.3.2.7**, the LA Metro Tree Policy contains measures to protect trees designated for retention and tree replacement requirements for trees to be removed. Specifically, Metro would prepare a tree protection plan for all trees designated for protection and a mitigation plan for damaged trees and trees whose removal cannot be avoided. Street trees removed in association with the project would be replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio with 36-inch box trees at or*

near the removal location. Heritage or protected trees that would require removal would be replaced at a 4:1 ratio by the trees of the same variety. In accordance with the policy, Metro would impose a 3-year establishment period for any replacement trees. In addition to these measures, Metro would collaborate with the local jurisdictions along the alignment on tree removal/replacement, as well as consistency with ~~L~~local tree protection policies *that* typically require tree removal permits ~~which~~ *and* may include tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with *local* tree protection policies.

Page 79. The second paragraph of **Section 7.4.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

As Project design progresses and construction plans are finalized it may be possible to minimize the number of affected trees by avoidance or fencing. *Moreover, in accordance with the tree protection plan, Metro would protect large trees that would remain in place from immediate damage during construction and from delayed damage due to construction activities, such as loss of root area or compaction of the soil by equipment. In addition,* ~~P~~prior to construction, local policies and municipal codes regarding protection of both native trees and street trees would be considered to ensure compliance requirements are met.

Page 79. **Section 7.4.1.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of Alternative 1 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and in coordination with* local tree protection policies, which typically require tree removal permits and a plan for tree replacement or relocation.

Page 79. **Section 7.4.1.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of the Montebello At-Grade Option would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and in coordination with* local tree protection policies, which typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 80. **Section 7.4.2.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Similar to Alternative 1, any maintenance of LRT facilities that entails tree trimming would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees, as outlined in **Section 3.3.2**.

Page 80. **Section 7.4.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Construction of Alternative 2 may require tree removal or trimming. This work would be conducted in accordance *with the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees. *Metro's tree policy contains*

measures to protect trees designated for retention and tree replacement requirements for trees to be removed. In addition, local ~~T~~tree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 80. **Section 7.4.2.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Option, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> Construction of Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and in coordination with* local tree protection policies, which typically require tree removal permits and a plan for tree replacement or relocation.

Page 81. **Section 7.4.3.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> Similar to Alternative 1, any maintenance of LRT facilities that entails tree trimming would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect native trees and street trees, as outlined in **Section 3.3.2;** therefore, the operation of Alternative 3 would not conflict with local policies and municipal codes protecting trees or other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. There would be no impact from operation of Alternative 3.

Page 81. **Section 7.4.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> Construction of Alternative 3 may require tree removal or trimming. This work would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy and in coordination with* local policies and municipal codes that protect both native trees and street trees. *Metro's tree policy contains measures to protect trees designated for retention and tree replacement requirements for trees to be removed. In addition, local* ~~T~~tree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies. Therefore, the construction of Alternative 3 would not conflict with local policies and municipal codes protecting trees or other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Pages 81-82. **Section 7.4.3.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> Construction of Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would be conducted in accordance with *the LA Metro Tree Policy, including provisions for tree protection and replacement, and in coordination with* local tree protection policies, which typically require tree removal permits and a plan for tree replacement or relocation.

Page 82. **Section 7.4.3.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> Construction of the Montebello At-Grade Option may require tree removal and trimming, which would be conducted in accordance with tree protection policies. *The LA Metro Tree Policy includes provisions for tree protection and replacement; other local* ~~T~~tree protection policies

typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 82. **Section 7.4.4.1.1**, Commerce MSF, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Thus, operation of the Commerce MSF site option would not conflict with *the LA Metro Tree Policy or with* local policies and municipal codes protecting trees.

Page 82. **Section 7.4.4.1.2**, Montebello MSF, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Thus, operation of the Montebello MSF site option would not conflict with *the LA Metro Tree Policy or with* local policies and municipal codes protecting trees.

Page 82. **Section 7.4.4.1.2**, Montebello MSF, Subsection Design Option, Montebello MSF At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Thus, operation of the Montebello MSF At-Grade Option would not conflict with *the LA Metro Tree Policy or with* local policies and municipal codes protecting trees.

Page 83. **Section 7.4.4.2.1**, Commerce MSF, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

This work would be conducted in accordance with policies and codes protecting trees. *The LA Metro Tree Policy includes provisions for tree protection and replacement, and local* ~~T~~tree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 83. **Section 7.4.4.2.2**, Montebello MSF, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

This work would be conducted in accordance with policies and codes protecting trees. *The LA Metro Tree Policy includes provisions for tree protection and replacement, and local* ~~T~~tree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 83. **Section 7.4.4.2.2**, Montebello MSF, Subsection Design Option, Montebello MSF At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

This work would be conducted in accordance with policies and codes protecting trees. *The LA Metro Tree Policy includes provisions for tree protection and replacement, and local* ~~T~~tree protection policies typically require tree removal permits and tree replacement or relocation under a plan prepared in compliance with these policies.

Page 85 - 93. The following mitigation measures (MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, MM BIO-4, MM BIO-5, and MM BIO-6) in **Section 9.0**, Mitigation Measures and Impacts After Mitigation, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.5** in this chapter.

Page 92. **Section 9.2.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency.

> As discussed in **Section 7.2.1**, the base Alternative 1 could have a significant impact under Impact BIO-2 during construction *within the rivers and spreading grounds*. Significant impacts on ~~native~~ vegetation communities and habitat would occur from the spread of invasive species *and tree pathogens* from equipment use during construction activities.

Page 94. **Section 9.2.2**, Alternative 2 Atlantic to Commerce/Citadel IOS is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> As discussed in **Section 7.2.2**, the base Alternative 2 *would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 during operations and construction. Therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~could have a significant impact under Impact BIO-2 during construction. Significant impacts on native vegetation communities and habitat would occur from the spread of invasive species from equipment used during construction activities.~~

Page 94. **Section 9.2.2.1**, Potential Operational or Construction Mitigation Measures is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> *Operation and construction of the base Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2; therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~Mitigation measures MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as described in Section 9.2.1.1, will be implemented.~~

Page 94. **Section 9.2.2.2**, Design Option Potential Operational or Construction Mitigation Measures, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> *Operation and construction of the base Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2; therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~Mitigation measures MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as described in Section 9.2.1.1, will be implemented.~~

Page 95. **Section 9.2.2.3.2,** Construction Impacts Determination, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> *Construction of the base Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 and no mitigation is required.* ~~Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6 would reduce construction impacts from the base Alternative 2 under Impact BIO-2 to a less than significant level.~~

Page 95. **Section 9.2.2.3.2,** Construction Impacts Determination, Design Option, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> *Construction of the base Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 and no mitigation is required.* ~~Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6 would reduce construction impacts from Alternative 2 with the sAtlantic/Pomona Station Option under Impact BIO-2 to a less than significant level.~~

Page 95. **Section 9.2.3**, Alternative 3 Atlantic to Greenwood IOS, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

As discussed in **Section 7.2.3**, the base Alternative 3 *would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 during operations and construction. Therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~could have a significant impact under Impact BIO-2 during construction. Significant impacts on native vegetation communities and habitat would occur from the spread of invasive species from equipment used during construction activities.~~

Page 95. **Section 9.2.3.1**, Potential Operational or Construction Mitigation Measures is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

*As discussed in **Section 7.2.3**, operation and construction of the base Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2; therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~Mitigation measures MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as described in Section 9.2.1.1, will be implemented.~~

Page 95. **Section 9.2.3.2**, Design Option Potential Operational or Construction Mitigation Measures, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

*As discussed in **Section 7.2.3**, operation and construction of Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2; therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~Mitigation measures MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as described in Section 9.2.1.1, will be implemented.~~

Page 95. Section 9.2.3.2, Design Option Potential Operational or Construction Mitigation Measures, Montebello At-Grade Option is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

*As discussed in **Section 7.2.3**, operation and construction of Alternative 3 with the Montebello At-Grade Option would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2; therefore, no mitigation is required.* ~~Mitigation measures MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6, as described in Section 9.2.1.1, will be implemented.~~

Page 96. **Section 9.2.3.3.2**, Construction Impacts Determination, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

Construction of the base Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 and no mitigation is required. ~~Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6 would reduce construction impacts from the base Alternative 3 under Impact BIO-2 to a less than significant level.~~

Page 96. **Section 9.2.3.3.2**, Construction Impacts Determination, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

Construction of the Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 and no mitigation is required. ~~Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6 would reduce construction impacts from Alternative 3 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option under Impact BIO-2 to a less than significant level.~~

Page 96. **Section 9.2.3.3.2,** Construction Impacts Determination, Design Options, Montebello At-Grade Option, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

Construction of the Alternative 3 with Montebello At-Grade Option would have less than significant impacts under Impact BIO-2 and no mitigation is required. ~~Implementation of MM-BIO-5 and MM-BIO-6 would reduce construction impacts from Alternative 2 with the Atlantic/Pomona Station Option under Impact BIO-2 to a less than significant level.~~

Page 99. **Section 9.5**, Mitigation Measure Applicability, **Table 9-1** Summary of Mitigation Measure Alternative Applicability is hereby revised as follows based further Project analysis and consistency:

Table 3-1. Summary of Mitigation Measure Alternative Applicability

Mitigation Measure	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	MSF
BIO-1 Special-Status Species				
MM BIO-1	Applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-2	Applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-3	Applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-4	Applicable	Applicable	Applicable	Applicable
BIO-2 Riparian Habitat/Sensitive Natural Communities				
MM BIO-5	Applicable	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	N/A
MM BIO-6	Applicable	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	N/A
BIO-3 Movement of Fish and Wildlife Species				
None required	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIO-4 Policies/Ordinances				
None required	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Page 105. **Section 13.0**, References Cited, is hereby revised to include the following reference to identify a policy adopted by Metro after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2022. LA Metro Tree Policy. Available at: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/x6nir6t3zhxr6b7/AAAk-ubvgrLdpSZ_X1ACqw2Sa?dl=0&preview=2022_LA+Metro+Tree+Policy.pdf. Accessed November 16, 2023.

3.3.3 Appendix E Cultural Resources

Page 63. **Section 6.2.4**, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse, 2353 Garfield Avenue (Reference No. 42), is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the city of Commerce:

The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse is an approximately 300,000-square-foot, one-story reinforced concrete bow truss-roofed warehouse with an attached one-story flat-roof office ell along the north (Washington Boulevard) elevation ~~(**Figure 6-15**)~~. ***Figure 6-15*** *shows the existing rail alignment north of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse.* Taking an architectural design approach that combines utilitarian elements with elements drawn from the International Style, the east elevation of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company

warehouse (approximately 90 percent of the building's floor area) is defined by 20 identical truck bays with bumper guards and roll-down doors.

Page 64. The title of **Figure 6.15** in **Section 6.2.4**, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse, 2353 Garfield Avenue (Reference No. 42), is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from the city of Commerce:

Figure 3.4.6. ~~Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse Constructed 1952 and Existing Rail Alignment Facing Washington Boulevard (2353 Garfield Avenue) (View east).~~ *Existing Rail Alignment North of Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company Warehouse at Washington Boulevard (View north)*

Page 94. **Section 7.1.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised to include the following subsections based on an omission in the Recirculated Draft EIR:

7.1.3.2.6 South Montebello Irrigation District Building, 864 Washington Boulevard

The South Montebello Irrigation District Building is significant for its associations with agriculture and as an intact example of a modestly scaled administrative building. Alternative 3 would be aerial in the center of Washington Boulevard near the South Montebello Irrigation District Building and the Greenwood station. Construction would include the aerial guideway and its foundations, aerial station, utility relocations, overhead catenary systems, restriping, curb-and-gutter/sidewalk reconstruction, roadway improvements, reconstruction of parking facilities, and lighting and traffic signal modifications. The station would include a side platform station located in the median of Washington Boulevard east of Greenwood Avenue and a parking facility along Greenwood Avenue and Washington Boulevard. The Greenwood station would be approximately 60 feet in front of the building.

Under Alternative 3, the South Montebello Irrigation District building would not be physically demolished, destroyed, relocated, or altered. The Greenwood station and the parking facilities adjacent to the building would introduce new visual, audible, and atmospheric elements within its immediate surroundings. However, the setting of the building has already been extensively modified and includes modern infrastructure and uses. The setting does not convey its historical associations to agriculture as it did during the building's period of significance of 1941. Although the proposed station would introduce a permanent visual element directly in front of the building, the relative height of the raised platform would not block any significant views of the historical resource, such as the view of the façade from the sidewalk or the westbound side of Washington Boulevard. The existing setting would be left largely intact. The lots adjacent to the school to the north and west are already paved, serve a similar use, and would be minimally altered to serve as a surface parking facility. Because the setting of the building is already compromised by modern development and activities, the significance of the historical resource would not be materially impaired; therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a less than significant impact.

7.1.3.2.7 William and Florence Kelly House, 860 Washington Boulevard

The William and Florence Kelly House is significant for its association with the residential development of Montebello in the pre–World War II era. Near the William and Florence Kelly House, Alternative 3 would construct an aerial alignment in the center of Washington Boulevard, including the aerial guideway and its foundations, aerial station, utility relocations, overhead catenary systems, restriping, curb-and-gutter/sidewalk reconstruction, roadway improvements, reconstruction of parking facilities, and lighting and traffic signal modifications. The station would include a side platform station located in the median of Washington Boulevard east of Greenwood Avenue and a parking facility along Greenwood Avenue and Washington Boulevard. The Greenwood station would be approximately 60 feet in front of the building.

Under Alternative 3, the William and Florence Kelly House would not be physically demolished, destroyed, relocated, or altered. The aerial structure, Greenwood station, and the parking facility to the north would introduce new visual, audible, and atmospheric elements within its immediate surroundings. However, the setting of the building has already been extensively modified and includes modern infrastructure and uses. The setting does not convey the associations the building had relative to agricultural purposes as it did during the building's period of significance, 1937. Although the proposed station would introduce a permanent visual element directly in front of the building, the relative height of the raised platform will not block any significant views of the historical resource, such as the view of the façade from the sidewalk or the westbound side of Washington Boulevard. The existing setting would be left largely intact. The lot adjacent to the building to the north is already paved, serves a similar use, and would be minimally altered to serve as a surface parking facility. Because the setting of the building is already compromised by modern development and activities, the significance of the historical resource would not be materially impaired; therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a less than significant impact.

Page 111 – Page 119. The following mitigation measures (MM CUL-1, MM CUL-4, MM CUL-7, MM CUL-8, and MM CUL-9) in **Section 8.0**, Mitigation Measures and Impacts After Mitigation, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.6** in this chapter.

3.3.4 Appendix F Utilities Service/Systems and Energy Conservation Impacts Report

Page 51. The last paragraph on page 51 in **Section 6.2.2**, Transportation Sector is hereby revised as follows as a correction:

> Highway traffic in the region was estimated to consume approximately 6.28 billion gallons of gasoline and 239 million gallons of diesel fuel under the Existing Conditions, equating to approximately 787,613 billion BTUs. ~~No LRT operates within the GSA under the existing conditions.~~ *Under existing conditions, LRT operates in the GSA from the western boundary to the existing E Line terminus at Atlantic Station in East Los Angeles.*

Page 59. **Section 7.1.1.2,** Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Construction of Alternative 1 would require relocating, temporarily rerouting, protecting in place or otherwise avoiding some utility supply lines or other facilities. The construction impacts of utility work (e.g., temporary disruption of service) would be localized, occurring generally at or near street intersections and have been evaluated as part of the Project in context with other physical effects on the environment in this EIR. During the Final Design phase, the Project team would coordinate with utility companies to request information, identify conflict locations between construction activities and existing facilities, and determine if relocation would be required or if utility lines could be protected in-place. Most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place with sleeve casing or other methods consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria. *Utility relocation work will generally occur within the affected ROW and on adjacent and nearby streets.* Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities.

Page 63. **Section 7.1.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Construction of Alternative 2 would require relocating, temporarily rerouting, or otherwise avoiding some utility supply lines or other facilities. The construction impacts of utility work (e.g., temporary disruption of service) would be localized, occurring generally at or near street intersections and have been evaluated as part of the Project in context with other physical effects on the environment in this EIR. During the Final Design phase, the Project team would coordinate with utility companies to request information, identify conflict locations between construction activities and existing facilities, and determine if relocation would be required or if equipment could be protected in-place. Most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place with sleeve casing or other methods consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria. *Utility relocation work will generally occur within the affected ROW and on adjacent and nearby streets.* Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities.

Page 67. **Section 7.1.3.2**, Construction Impacts is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Construction of Alternative 3 would require relocating, temporarily rerouting, or otherwise avoiding some utility supply lines or other facilities. The construction impacts of utility work (e.g., temporary disruption of service) would be localized, occurring generally at or near street intersections and have been evaluated as part of the Project in context with other physical effects on the environment in this EIR. During the Final Design phase, the Project team would

coordinate with utility companies to request information, identify conflict locations between construction activities and existing facilities, and determine if relocation would be required or if equipment could be protected in-place. Most utilities traversing the alignment would be protected in place with sleeve casing or other methods consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria. *Utility relocation work will generally occur within the affected ROW and on adjacent and nearby streets.* Preliminary relocation concepts would be developed and presented to each utility owner with affected facilities.

3.3.5 Appendix G Geology, Soils and Paleontological Resources

Page 86. The following project measure (PM GEO-1) in **Section 8.0**, Project Measures, is hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.8** of this chapter.

Page 91 – Page 102. The following mitigation measures (MM GEO-1, MM GEO-2, MM GEO-3, and MM GEO-4) in **Section 9.0**, Mitigation Measures, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.8** in this chapter.

3.3.6 Appendix I Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Page 45. The last sentence of the first paragraph of **Section 6.7**, Subsurface Gas Conditions and Oil and Gas Wells, is hereby revised as follows as a correction:

> However, the May 2021 Final Draft ISA Report notes that methane, hydrogen sulfide, and other oil-~~filed~~ *field* related gases could be present in the vicinity of oil and gas wells.

Page 48 - 49. **Section 6.10**, Proximity to Schools, is hereby revised to include two additional schools based on public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

> The following schools are located within one-quarter mile from the Alternative 1 alignment:
>
> - George Washington Elementary School, 7804 S. Thornlake Avenue, Whittier
> - Pioneer High School located at 10800 Benavon Street, Whittier
> - Ada S. Nelson Elementary School, 8140 South Vicki Drive, Whittier
> - Rivera Middle School located at 7200 Citronell Avenue, Pico Rivera
> - El Rancho High School located at 6501 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera
> - Greenwood Elementary School located at 900 South Greenwood Avenue, Montebello
> - Calvary Chapel Christian Academy, 931 South Maple Avenue, Montebello
> - KIPP Promesa Prep located at 5156 Whittier Boulevard, Los Angeles

- KIPP Raices Academy located at 668 South Atlantic Boulevard, East Los Angeles
- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles
- St. Alphonsus School, 552 South Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School, 4765 East Fourth Street, Los Angeles
- Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, 5115 Via Corona Street, Los Angeles

Page 70. The last paragraph of **Section 7.2.1.2** Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology and to improve clarity:

> Thus, MM HAZ-1 through MM HAZ-5, as discussed in **Section 9.2.1**, would be implemented. MM HAZ-1 requires a Phase II Environmental Site *Assessment* ~~Investigation~~ to be conducted before ground disturbing activities occur to determine the potential presence of petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and VOCs in soil and/or groundwater. MM HAZ-2 requires the preparation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan in consultation with LARWQCB that identifies and delineates contaminated areas; provides procedures for handling, excavating, and managing excavated soils and dewatering effluent and for notifying appropriate agencies; and provides requirements for site-specific *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~health and safety plans~~. MM HAZ-3 requires contractors to inspect soil and groundwater for signs of contamination, and if contaminated soil or groundwater is found, *halt work and test materials* ~~stop work within and cordon of the area, notify and coordinate with appropriate agencies~~, and develop an investigation and site-specific management plan. MM HAZ-4 requires the contractor to prepare site-specific *Safety Manuals and Construction Work Plans* ~~worker health and safety plans~~ that identify human health risks from hazardous materials and appropriate protocols to ensure worker safety.

Page 90. **Section 7.3.1.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised to include two additional schools in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

- KIPP Raices Academy located at 668 South Atlantic Boulevard, East Los Angeles
- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles

Page 91. **Section 7.3.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

> Parcels proposed for construction staging and construction easements would occur on sites with known hazardous materials releases within one-quarter mile of Greenwood Elementary School (APNs 6352-007-059 and 6352-007-060 [Site 18]), KIPP Promesa Prep and KIPP Raices Academy (APN 6340-001-001 [Site 5] and APN 6340-001-002 [Site 6]), and 4th Street Elementary, ~~and~~ Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* (APNs 5248-004-040 and 5248-004-043 [Site 1], APN 6341-001-038 [Site 2], APN 6341-001-017 [Site 3], and APN 5248-008-046 [Site 4]).

Page 93. **Section 7.3.2.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised to include two additional schools in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles

Page 94. **Section 7.3.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised to include two additional schools in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles

Page 94. **Section 7.3.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

> Parcels proposed for construction staging and construction easements would occur on sites with known hazardous materials releases within one-quarter mile of 4th Street Elementary School, ~~and~~ Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* (APNs 5248-004-040 and 5248-004-043 [Site 1], APN 6341-001-038 [Site 2], APN 6341-001-017 [Site 3], and APN 5248-008-046 [Site 4]).

Page 96. **Section 7.3.3.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised to include two additional schools in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

- KIPP Raices Academy located at 668 South Atlantic Boulevard, East Los Angeles
- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles

- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles

Page 97. **Section 7.3.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised to include two additional schools in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

- KIPP Raices Academy located at 668 South Atlantic Boulevard, East Los Angeles
- 4th Street Elementary located at 420 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles
- *4th Street Primary Center located at 469 Amalia Avenue, Los Angeles*
- *Esperanza College Prep at 414 S. Atlantic Boulevard, Los Angeles*
- Garfield High School located at 5101 East 6th Street, Los Angeles
- Monterey Senior High School, 466 South Fraser Street, Los Angeles

Page 98. **Section 7.3.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments received from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

> Parcels proposed for construction staging and construction easements would occur on sites with known hazardous materials releases within one-quarter mile of Greenwood Elementary School (APNs 6352-007-059 and 6352-007-060 [Site 18]), KIPP Promesa Prep and KIPP Raices Academy (APN 6340- 001-001 [Site 5] and APN 6340-001-002 [Site 6]), and 4th Street Elementary, ~~and~~ Arts in Action Community Charter Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* (APNs 5248-004-040 and 5248-004-043 [Site 1], APN 6341-001- 038 [Site 2], APN 6341-001-017 [Site 3], and APN 5248-008-046 [Site 4]).

Page 131 – Page 133. The following project measures (PM HAZ-1, PM HAZ-2, PM HAZ-3, and PM HAZ-4) in **Section 8.0**, Project Measures, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.9** in this chapter.

Page 136 – Page 138. The following mitigation measures (MM HAZ-1, MM HAZ-2, MM HAZ-3, and MM HAZ-4) in **Section 9.0**, Mitigation Measures and Impacts After Mitigation, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.9** in this chapter.

3.3.7 Appendix J Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 23. The first paragraph at the top of page 23 in **Section 3.2.4**, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> As with the Industrial General Permit, the SWRCB administers the Construction General Permit, which is applicable to all stormwater discharges associated with construction activity. The NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance

Activities (the Construction General Permit) was adopted on ~~September 2, 2009~~ *September 8, 2022, and becomes effective on September 1, 2023*. ~~The provisions of the new~~ *This* Construction General Permit *(Order WQ 2022-0057-DWQ, NPDES NO. CAS000002) supersedes the previous Construction General Permit* (Order #2009-0009-DWQ ~~[State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality]~~*as amended by Order 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ*)~~became effective July 1, 2010 and was amended by Order # 2010-014-DWQ on February 14, 2011, and 2012-0006-DWQ on July 17, 2012. This Order has been administratively extended until a new order is adopted and becomes effective. Order #2009-0009-DWQ supersedes the previous Construction General Permit (Order #99-08-DWQ) (SWRCB 2012). The new Order has similar requirements to the current permit, but it specifies more minimum BMPs that were previously only required as elements of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or suggested by guidance.~~

Pages 23 – 24. **Section 3.2.4**, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

Minimum stormwater control requirements under the permit are determined by project risk categories. Risk categories include the sediment risk factor and the receiving water risk factor. These are combined to determine a construction site's project risk level. The project risk level governs the applicable minimum BMPs, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, and the effluent standards used to assess monitoring data and compliance. Once the project risk level is determined, minimum BMP requirements are specified in the Construction General Permit. BMPs are separated into ~~five~~ *the following* overall categories:

- Good Site Management "Housekeeping"
- Non-stormwater Management
- *Preserve Existing Topsoil*
- Erosion Control
- Sediment Controls
- ~~Run-on and runoff controls~~
- *Additional BMPs For Higher Risk Levels*
- *Surface Water Buffer*
- *Pesticide Application*
- *Demolition*
- *Maintenance and Repair*

Potential BMPs are described in further detail in **Section 8.0**. Monitoring and reporting requirements under the permit are also dependent on the project risk level. Visual monitoring of stormwater and non-stormwater discharges is required of all projects. Water quality sampling and analysis requirements increase with risk category. Monitoring is required during normal construction site hours. Rain events also trigger monitoring ~~in the case that there is a one-half~~

~~inch or more of precipitation within a period of 48 hours~~ *during active discharge, depending on the project's risk level.*

In order to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit, the permit applicant must file the following with ~~the~~ SWRCB:

- NOI
- Risk ~~Assessment~~ *Level Determination*
- Site Map *and Drawings*
- *Site-specific* SWPPP
- *Post-construction Calculations and Plans*
- Annual Fee
- Signed Certification Statement

Page 25 – Page 26. **Section 3.3.1.1**, NPDES Permits, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

LARWQCB is responsible for issuing the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit (*Order No. R4 2021 0105, NPDES Permit No. CAS004004* ~~Order No. R4-2012-0175, NPDES No. CAS 004001, as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075 on June 16, 2015 and Los Angeles Water Board Order R4-2012-0175-A01 on September 8, 2016, and as modified by LARWQCB on July 9, 2018~~). The existing permit covers the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD), Los Angeles County, and *85*~~84~~ incorporated cities within the coastal watersheds of Los Angeles County (including the cities and unincorporated county in the DSAs)~~, with the exception of the City of Long Beach (LARWQCB 2016~~ *(LARWQCB 2021b)*. The permit covers the permittees for contributions to discharges of stormwater and urban runoff from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), also called storm drain systems. The discharges flow to water courses within the LACFCD and into receiving waters of the Los Angeles region. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260).

The objectives of MS4 permits are to effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges through MS4s to the region's waterways, to reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable, and to implement other pollutant controls as necessary to achieve water quality standards (~~LARWQCB 2014~~*LARWQCB 2021b*). Operators of regulated MS4s are required to develop a stormwater management plan (SWMP) that includes measurable goals and to implement needed stormwater management controls (e.g., BMPs). NPDES regulations require assessment and revision of the stormwater management program in order to continue, to the maximum extent practicable, to not cause or contribute to water quality standards exceedances. Stormwater program activities are continually adjusted based on the results of an effectiveness evaluation (USEPA 2008).

The current MS4 permit imposes basic programs, or minimum control measures, that mitigate stormwater quality issues. These programs include public information and participation, industrial/commercial inspection, planning and land development, ~~development~~

construction, public agency activities, and illicit connection/discharge abatement (*LARWQCB 2021b* ~~Los Angeles County 2015~~). To illustrate, the implementation of temporary construction BMPs, such as erosion control and spill management and safe storage of fluids, are required under the development construction program. Post-construction stormwater BMPs are required for most public and private development under the planning and land development program. MS4 permit requirements would apply to Project operation and construction.

~~Compared to the previous MS4 permit (authorized under Order No. 01-182), there is an increased emphasis on watershed planning under the current order.~~ *The current MS4 permit emphasizes watershed planning.* Watershed planning is emphasized because it allows permittees to focus on water quality results by analyzing the receiving waters within a watershed; additionally, TMDLs established by the USEPA and LARWQCB apply to a watershed scale. The current MS4 permit allows permittees to develop Watershed Management Programs (WMP) ~~or Enhanced Watershed Management Programs (EWMP)~~ to implement MS4 permit requirements, including the minimum control measures described above, through BMPs, control measures, and customized strategies targeted at the watershed level.

Page 27 – Page 28. **Section 3.3.1.6**, Watershed Management and Enhanced Watershed Management Programs, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

According to the ~~most current~~ *previous* MS4 Order *(Order Number R4-2012-0175),* the ultimate goal of the WMP ~~and EWMP~~ is to ensure that "discharges from the Los Angeles County MS4: (i) achieve applicable water quality-based effluent limitations that implement TMDLs, (ii) do not cause or contribute to exceedances of receiving water limitations, and (iii) for non-stormwater discharges from the MS4, are not sources of pollutants to receiving waters." The WMP allows permittees to develop and customize control measures to address water quality issues within their watershed management areas. *Under the current MS4, "approved WMP" includes WMPs and Enhanced Watershed Management Programs (EWMPs) that were developed pursuant to the previous MS4 permits (Order Number R4-2012-0175 and Order Number R4- 2014-0024).* Plans relevant to the DSAs include the Upper Los Angeles River Watershed's EWMP, approved in 2016, the Lower San Gabriel River WMP, approved in 2015 and modified in 2017, and the Los Angeles River Upper Reach 2 Coordinated Integrated Monitoring Program, approved in 2016 (LARWQCB 2019b).

Page 31. **Section 3.4.1.5**, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, is hereby revised as follows to identify plan updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) is responsible for planning and implementation of watershed management within the county. ~~Watershed management plans that pertain to the DSAs include the San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan (2006) and the Los Angeles River Master Plan (LACDPW, LACDPR, and LACDRP 1996, 2021).The main goals of these watershed management plans are the protection and enhancement of the rivers for flood protection, recreation, and environmental services. The Los Angeles River Master Plan is currently in the process of being updated (LACDPW, LACDPR, and LACDRP 2021).~~ *The Los Angeles River Master Plan (Los Angeles County and LACDPW 2022) applies to the DSA. The main goal of this watershed management plan is the protection and enhancement of the river for flood protection, recreation, and environmental services, such as water reliability and quality. The plan also focuses on equitable access to the river corridor, housing affordability in neighboring communities, and cultural assets supported by the river.*

Page 57. The last paragraph of **Section 6.7**, Municipal Water Supply, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

> The LACDPW maintains a database of groundwater supply wells (LACDPW 2019). According to this database, the majority of groundwater wells are near the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River. ~~Additionally, there are 10 municipal water wells located within approximately 0.5 miles of the proposed underground guideway portion of the Build Alternatives and the aerial portion of Alternatives 1 and 3. There is one municipal well located approximately 0.5 miles from the at-grade portion of Alternative 1. Most of these wells are located approximately 1,800 feet or more away from the Build Alternatives.~~ *According to this database, the majority of groundwater wells in or near the DSA are near the Rio Hondo. Most drinking water wells are located approximately 0.4 miles or more away from the Build Alternatives. One drinking water well is located approximately 200 feet west of the underground portion of the Build Alternatives. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs.* A former municipal well near the Commerce MSF site option has been destroyed.

Page 58. **Section 7.1.1.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to identify permit updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

> The Project could result in potential direct impacts on surface water quality by increasing stormwater runoff and producing contaminants typically associated with transit, such as oil and grease, that could be carried by the stormwater runoff into surface waters. However, the DSA is already highly urbanized and experiences high levels of vehicle use. Further, operations would be subject to the LARWQCB MS4 NPDES permit (~~Order No. R4-2012-0175 and NPDES No. CAS004001~~ *Order No. R4 2021 0105, NPDES Permit No. CAS004004*) and its associated BMPs for activities such as roadway paving or repair operation and public agency facilities and activities.

Page 62. The seventh paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

> MM HAZ-2, discussed in **Section 9.1.1**, requires the preparation of a Soil and Groundwater Management Plan in consultation with LARWQCB *and other appropriate regulatory agencies*. The plan would identify and delineate contaminated areas; provide procedures for handling, excavating, and managing excavated soils and dewatering effluent and for notifying appropriate agencies; and provide requirements for site-specific *safety manuals and construction work plans* ~~health and safety plans~~. Thus, implementation of MM HAZ-2 would help minimize the spread of contaminated groundwater and would reduce this potential impact from construction of Alternative 1 to less than significant.

Page 63. The eighth paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and terminology:

> MM HAZ-3 is discussed in **Section 9.1.1** and requires contractors to inspect groundwater for signs of contamination, and if contaminated groundwater is found, *halt work and test materials* ~~stop work in the vicinity of area, cordon off the area, notify and coordinate with appropriate agencies~~, and develop an investigation and site-specific groundwater management plan to ensure contaminants are not spread. Thus, implementation of MM HAZ-3 would reduce this potential impact from construction of Alternative 1 to less than significant.

Page 80. The first paragraph of **Section 7.2.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

> There could be potential impacts on groundwater supplies and recharge under Alternative 1 from dewatering activities, which have the potential to lower the groundwater table. Groundwater dewatering would take place during construction, particularly during the construction of the underground guideway and station construction. *The majority of groundwater wells are located 0.4 miles or farther away* ~~However, the closest groundwater well is approximately 1,800 feet away~~ from the underground guideway (**Section 6.7**), and thus dewatering would not be expected to affect *these* groundwater wells. *The closest groundwater well is approximately 200 feet west of the underground guideway. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs, which is well below the depth of the tunnel at 60 feet.* Additionally, groundwater well depths, are relatively deep near the underground alignment, which would reduce the likelihood that groundwater would be encountered during construction of the tunnel.

Page 83. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

> There could be potential impacts on groundwater supplies and recharge under Alternative 2 from dewatering activities related to the construction of the underground guideway and stations. Dewatering activities have the potential to lower the groundwater table and contaminate groundwater resources. *The majority of groundwater wells are located 0.4 miles or farther away* ~~However, the closest groundwater well is approximately 1,800 feet away~~ from the underground guideway (**Section 6.7**), and thus dewatering would not be expected to affect *these* groundwater wells. *The closest groundwater well is approximately 200 feet west of the underground guideway. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs, which is well below the depth of the tunnel at 60 feet.* Additionally, groundwater depths, and therefore well depths, are relatively deep near the underground alignment, which would reduce the likelihood that groundwater would be encountered during construction of the tunnel.

Page 85. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

> There could be potential impacts on groundwater supplies and recharge under Alternative 3 from dewatering activities related to the construction of the underground guideway and stations. Dewatering activities have the potential to lower the groundwater table and contaminate groundwater resources. *The majority of groundwater wells are located 0.4 miles or farther away* ~~However, the closest groundwater well is approximately 1,800 feet away~~ from the underground guideway (**Section 6.7**), and thus dewatering would not be expected to affect *these* groundwater wells. *The closest groundwater well is approximately 200 feet west of the underground guideway. The depth of this well is approximately 200 feet bgs, which is well below the depth of the tunnel at 60 feet.* Additionally, groundwater depths, and therefore well depths, are relatively deep near the underground alignment, which would reduce the likelihood that groundwater would be encountered during construction of the tunnel.

Page 133 – Page 134. The following project measures (PM HWQ-1 and PM HWQ-2) in **Section 8.0**, Project Measures, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.10** in this chapter.

Page 142. MM HWQ-2 in **Section 9.2.1.1**, Potential Operational or Construction Mitigation Measures, is hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.10** in this chapter.

Pages 162 – 166. **Section 13.0**, References Cited, is hereby revised as follows to identify updates after the Recirculated Draft EIR was published:

California SWRCB. 2022. Order WQ 2022-0057-DWQ. NPDES No. CAS000002. General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (General Permit). Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction/docs/2022-0057-dwq-with-attachments/cgp2022_order.pdf. Accessed April 27, 2023.

~~Los Angeles County, Department of Public Works; Los Angeles County, Department of Parks and Recreation; Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning (LACDPW, LACDPR, and LACDRP). 1996. Los Angeles River Master Plan. June. Available at: https://ladpw.org/wmd/watershed/LA/LARMP/. Accessed May 18, 2021.~~

~~LACDPW, LACDPR, and LACDRP. 2021. Draft Los Angeles River Master Plan. January. Available at: https://pw.lacounty.gov/wmd/watershed/lar/docs/LARMP-MainVolumeEnglish-PUBLICDRAFT.pdf. Accessed May 18, 2021.~~

Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). 2022. Los Angeles River Master Plan. Available at: https://pw.lacounty.gov/uploads/swp/LARiverMasterPlan-FINAL-DIGITAL-COMPRESSED.pdf. Accessed June 27, 2023.

LARWQCB. 2021b. Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Discharges within the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/public_docs/2022/1_Order(ACC-RPSignature).pdf. Accessed April 12, 2023.

3.3.8 Appendix K Land Use and Planning

Page 16. **Section 3.1**, Federal, is hereby revised to include the following federal regulation in response to public comments:

~~There are no federal policies and regulations that are directly applicable to the land use impacts analysis; however,~~ *F*~~f~~ederal permitting would be required for construction at the San Gabriel River and the Rio Hondo tributary of the Los Angeles River. Structural features, fill near levees, or other flood control facilities would require permits and/or approval from the United States Army Corps of Engineers and may be subject to specific flood-related regulations. Regulations governing development within flood control facilities are discussed in the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts Report.

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) mandates that certain relocation services and payments be made available to eligible residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced as a direct result of projects undertaken by a federal agency or with federal financial assistance. The Uniform Act provides for uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced from their homes or businesses and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies. Relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to

displaced businesses in compliance with state regulations and Metro's policies. However, economic impacts could occur to other businesses that depend on the revenue generated by transactions with businesses that would be displaced by the Project. Under the regulations of the Uniform Act, since the businesses that experience those economic impacts would not be displaced by the Project, they would not be eligible for financial assistance under the Uniform Act.

Page 16. **Section 3.2**, State, is hereby revised to include the following state regulation as a new subsection in response to public comments:

Section 3.2.2 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.

Page 40. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Pages 40-41. **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option, are hereby revised to improve clarity:

Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 42. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 43. **Section 7.1.2.2**, Construction Impacts, Design Option, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option is hereby revised to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 45. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 46. **Section 7.1.3.2**, Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option is hereby revised to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 58. The first paragraph of **Section 7.2.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments and to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process. Property acquisition would be generally limited to properties currently zoned for commercial or industrial uses, and no residential uses, churches, schools, parks, or other sensitive land uses would be permanently acquired. *Relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to displaced businesses in compliance with federal and state regulations and Metro's policies. Because the properties acquired for construction activities would be available for future use under the same land use designations, property acquisitions are not anticipated to result in economic or social harm that could lead to physical impacts such as deterioration of surrounding businesses. While economic impacts could occur to other businesses that depend on the revenue generated by transactions with businesses that would be displaced by the Project, since 2014, Metro has launched pilot programs that provide financial assistance to small businesses located along rail corridors under construction. These programs include a Metro Business Interruption Fund, a Metro Business Solution Center, and Metro's Eat Shop Play Local business mitigation program meant to bring focused attention to local businesses affected by Metro construction, would be implemented. Additionally, Metro's Construction Relations Officers will work with local businesses to provide signage and marketing assistance, such as providing "Open During Construction," wayfinding, and promotional signage for businesses.* The property acquisition for construction under Alternative 1

would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Page 59. The first paragraphs of **Section 7.2.1.2**, Construction Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option, are hereby revised to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Pages 61 and 64. The first paragraph of **Section 7.2.2.2**, Construction Impacts, and first paragraph of **Section 7.2.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments and to improve clarity:

> The properties under construction easements would retain their original land use designation and zoning classifications, and upon termination of the construction easement, would return to their original use. Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes from this environmental review process. Property acquisition would be generally limited to properties currently zoned for commercial or industrial uses. *Relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to displaced businesses in compliance with federal and state regulations and Metro's policies. Because the properties acquired for construction activities would be available for future use under the same land use designations, property acquisitions are not anticipated to result in economic or social harm that could lead to physical impacts such as deterioration of surrounding businesses.*

Page 62. The first paragraph of **Section 7.2.2.2** Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Option, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

Page 64 – Page 65. The first paragraphs of **Section 7.2.3.2**, Construction Impacts, Subsection Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option and Montebello At-Grade Option is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties acquired for construction activities *may* ~~would~~, upon completion of the construction activities, be available for joint development or parking facilities subject to standard planning and permitting review processes separate from this environmental review process.

3.3.9 Appendix L Noise and Vibration

Page 41. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.1.4**, Impacts from Traction Power Substations, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency:

As set forth in PM NOI-1 (**Section 8.0**), each TPSS would be designed in accordance with the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) of 45 dBA at 50 feet or at the setback line of the nearest building or occupied area, whichever is closer ~~(Metro 2018)~~.

Page 45. The fourth non-bulleted paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

The Project also includes a tunnel section, which would involve excavation and shoring of the launching and receiving pits, tunneling with the use of the TBM, and *spoil* ~~muck~~ removal. Ventilation would be required during construction and operation of Alternative 1 for adequate circulation of air flow in the tunnels. Tunnel vent fans would be located at ground surface level and their activation would increase ambient noise levels for their surrounding areas and would therefore result in a potentially significant impact. Tunneling activities would require the use of machinery to remove excavation spoils ~~(i.e., muck)~~ from the TBM. *Spoil* ~~Muck~~ removal and heavy machinery such as excavators and mini-excavators to move TBM spoils would be a source of noise during construction activities that could increase ambient noise levels.

Page 47 – Page 48. The fourth, third, and second to the last paragraphs of **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, are hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity:

Section 8.0 describes project measures related to construction noise that are components to the Project. As described in PM NOI-1, each TPSS would be designed in accordance with the MRDC of 45 dBA at 50 feet or at the setback line of the nearest building or occupied area, whichever is closer ~~(Metro 2018)~~. Additionally, as described in PM NOI-2 (Section 8.0), all construction activities would be carried out in compliance with Metro's baseline specifications Section 01_56_19, Construction Noise and Vibration Control, to reduce noise generation associated with construction activities to the degree feasible by using methods that may include, but not be limited to, conducting *at-grade* construction *adjacent to residential neighborhoods* in daytime hours *whenever practicable*, using construction equipment with noise-suppression devices, and using noise barriers or other noise control measures. Implementation of these project measures would reduce construction noise; however, mitigation measures identified in **Section 9.1.1** and summarized below would be required to further reduce noise impacts.

MM NOI-1 would require implementation of a noise control plan and construction monitoring plan that would meet, at minimum, the FTA general assessment noise criteria *for daytime and nighttime construction work*. MM NOI-2 would require Metro's contractor to use cast-in-drill hole (CIDH) or drilled piles rather than impact pile drivers *where necessary to meet construction noise performance criteria established in the construction noise control plan and construction monitoring plan* ~~except where these are impracticable to reduce excessive noise~~. MM NOI-3 would require the construction contractor to erect temporary noise barriers between noisy activities and noise sensitive receptors to ensure compliance with applicable noise limits. Noise barriers block the direct path of sound waves and would reduce noise impacts from receptors when applied. MM NOI-4 would require Metro's contractor to locate construction equipment and material staging areas away from sensitive receptors where practicable to increase the distance between receptors and noise generating construction equipment/material staging areas. MM NOI-5 would require construction traffic and haul route routing in areas without noise-sensitive receptors where practicable, thereby minimizing traffic noise. MM NOI-6 would require contractors to use best available control technologies (e.g., piling noise shrouds) to limit excessive noise when working near residences where

practicable to muffle sounds created by Project-related construction equipment and therefore reduce noise levels. ~~MM NOI-7 would require the contractor wherever practicable, to conduct construction activities during the daytime and during weekdays in residential areas, since noise is more disruptive at night and weekends when residents are more likely to be home.~~ MM NOI-8 would require Metro to establish a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues arising from construction activities.

~~MM NOI-9 and MM NOI-10, identified in **Section 9.1.1**, would require using a muck removal conveyor for the TBM if practicable, with specifications to reduce noise generation, including using temporary tunnel track with smooth rail and wheels, limiting car speeds and removing the muck by truck during the day where the haul route impacts residences.~~ Implementation of MM NOI-9 and MM NOI-10 would lessen noise associated with *spoil* ~~muck~~ removal *where necessary* and minimize ~~nighttime~~ *residential* noise impacts. MM NOI-11 as discussed in in **Section 9.1.1** would reduce impacts from ventilation fans by requiring that they be placed away from sensitive receptors, thereby Increasing distance between sensitive receptors and noise generating ventilation fans.

Page 52. The final paragraph of **Section 7.1.2.2** Construction Impacts is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

Additionally, MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11, summarized in **Section 9.0**, would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Page 56. The final paragraph of **Section 7.1.3.2** Construction Impacts is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11, summarized in **Section 7.1.1.2** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Pages 58-59. The final paragraph of **Section 7.1.4.2.2** Montebello MSF is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

Additionally, MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11, summarized in **Section 7.1.1.2** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Page 59. The final paragraph of **Section 7.1.4.2.2** Montebello MSF, Subsection Design Option, Montebello MSF At-Grade Option is hereby revised as follows to update terminology:

Additionally, MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-11, summarized in **Section 7.1.1.2** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would reduce construction noise levels experienced by sensitive receptors through means such as use of noise buffers, maximizing the distance between noise generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, minimizing noise generation such as through the use of equipment mufflers to the degree feasible, and establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve noise issues.

Page 65-66. The third and second to the last paragraphs of **Section 7.2.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows based on advancements in project engineering and to improve clarity:

MM NOI-2 would require Metro's contractor to use CIDH or drilled piles rather than impact pile drivers to reduce excessive vibration, *where necessary to meet performance criteria* ~~except where these are impracticable~~, because pre-drilling reduces noise and vibration impacts by reducing the rate of displacement and compression of the surrounding soil. MM NOI-4 would require Metro's contractor to locate construction equipment and material staging areas away from sensitive receptors to increase distance in relation to sensitive receptors and thereby reduce impacts. MM NOI-5 would require Metro's contractor to route construction traffic, and haul routes away from sensitive receptors where practicable to reduce vibratory impacts related to haul routes. ~~MM NOI-7 would require the contractor wherever practicable, to conduct construction activities during the daytime and weekdays to reduce nighttime and weekend disruption when residents are more likely to be home.~~ MM NOI-8 would require Metro to establish a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve vibration issues. MM NOI-9 would require using a *spoil* ~~muck~~ removal conveyor for the TBM *where necessary* ~~if practicable, with specifications~~ to reduce vibration, including using temporary tunnel track with smooth rail and wheels.

MM NOI-14 would require Metro to *identify* ~~conduct a survey of selected~~ properties *that may be susceptible to vibration damage* within 100 feet of the alignment to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition of walls and joints to provide a basis for comparison after construction is completed and to provide baseline data for monitoring vibration impacts and developing the construction vibration control plan and monitoring plan described in MM NOI-15. Under MM NOI-15, Metro would require the contractor to develop a construction vibration control plan and a construction vibration monitoring plan to minimize vibration impact and reduce the risk of damage to susceptible structures.

Page 70. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.2.2** Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency:

MM NOI-2, MM NOI-4, MM NOI-5, MM NOI-7, MM NOI-8, MM NOI-9, MM NOI-14, and MM NOI-15, summarized in the construction evaluation in **Section 7.1.1.2** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would reduce vibration effects through means such as requiring use of equipment that produces less vibration, maximizing the distance between vibration generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve vibration issues, *identifying properties that may be susceptible to vibration damage* ~~surveying properties to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition~~, and developing a construction vibration control plan and monitoring plan.

Page 74. The second paragraph of **Section 7.2.3.2** Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity and consistency:

MM NOI-2, MM NOI-4, MM NOI-5, MM NOI-7, MM NOI-8, MM NOI-9, MM NOI-14, and MM NOI-15, summarized in the construction evaluation in **Section 7.1.1.2** and identified in **Section 9.0**, would reduce vibration effects through means such as requiring use of equipment that produces less vibration, maximizing the distance between vibration generating activities and sensitive receptors to the degree feasible, establishing a *Construction* ~~Noise and Vibration Complaint~~ Hotline to resolve vibration issues*, identifying properties that may be susceptible to vibration damage* ~~surveying properties to determine the baseline structural integrity and condition~~, and developing a construction vibration control plan and monitoring plan.

Page 77. The following project measures (PM NOI-1 and PM NOI-2) in **Section 8.0**, Project Measures, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.12** in this chapter.

Page 78 – Page 86. The following mitigation measures (MM NOI-1 through MM NOI-3, MM NOI-7 through MM NOI-10, and MM NOI-12 through MM NOI-14) in **Section 9.0**, Mitigation Measures and Impacts After Mitigation, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.12** in this chapter.

3.3.10 Appendix M Community and Neighborhood Impacts Report

Page 38. **Section 6.1**, Population and Housing, **Table 6-4** General Demographic Characteristics of Census Tracts within 0.5 Miles of Stations, is hereby revised as follows to provide more information on ethnicity in response to public comments:

Table 6-4. 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[1]	49,122	41%
Two or more races[2]	2,476	2%
ETHNICITY		
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)[3]	106,823	~~N/A~~ *89%*
Not Hispanic or Latino (Some other race)	*7,277*	*6%*
Not Hispanic or Latino (White alone)	*5,659*	*5%*
Minority[4]	*114,100*	*95%*
TRANSIT-DEPENDENT POPULATION GROUPS		
Students Age 5-19	25,062	21%

	Persons	% of Population
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.
Notes:
1 *Includes responses in the 2019 U.S. Census for "Black or African American," "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Asian," and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" race categories listed in the rows above. Also respondents providing write-in entries such as multiracial, mixed, or interracial in the "Some Other Race" write-in space are included in this category.*
2 *Includes those people who chose to provide two or more races on the U.S. Census by selecting two or more race response check boxes. There are 57 possible combinations involving the race categories (Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and/or Some Other Race).*
3 *Includes Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Other Hispanic or Latino groups.*
4 *Includes the sum of Hispanic or Latino (of any race) and Not Hispanic or Latino (Some other races).*

Page 42. **Section 6.2.2**, Schools, **Table 6-8** Schools within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Table 6-8. Schools within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives

Map ID	School Type	Name	Address	City
16	Public Elementary	*4th Street* ~~Fourth Street~~	420 South Amalia Ave	Los Angeles
17	Public Elementary	Ada S. Nelson	8140 South Vicki Dr	Whittier
18	Public Elementary	Greenwood	900 South Greenwood Ave	Montebello
19	Public Elementary	George Washington	7804 S. Thornlake Ave	Whittier
20	Public Middle	David Wark Griffith	4765 East Fourth St	Los Angeles
21	Public High	Monterey Continuation	466 South Fraser St	Los Angeles
22	Public High	James A. Garfield Senior	5101 East Sixth St	Los Angeles
23	Public High	Pioneer	10800 Benavon St	Whittier
24	Public Charter	KIPP Raices Academy	668 Atlantic Blvd	Los Angeles
25	Public Charter	KIPP Promesa Prep	5156 Whittier Blvd	Los Angeles
26	Public Charter	Arts in Action Elementary	5115 Via Corona St	Los Angeles
27	Private	Calvary Chapel Christian Academy	931 South Maple Ave	Montebello
28	Private	St. Alphonsus School	552 South Amalia Ave	Los Angeles
	Public Elementary	*4th Street Primary Center*	*469 Amalia Avenue*	*Los Angeles*
	Public Charter High School	*Esperanza College Prep*	*414 S. Atlantic Blvd.*	*Los Angeles*

Page 43. **Section 6.3** Parks and Recreational Facilities, and **Table 6-10**, Parks and Recreational Facilities within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives, are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

> **Table 6-10** identifies the parks and recreational facilities within one quarter mile of the Build Alternatives and **Figure 6.1** shows their locations. Parks and recreational facilities in closest proximity to the Project are Atlantic Avenue Park on Atlantic Boulevard, Chet Holifield Park on Greenwood Avenue, and the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds and ~~bike~~ *multi-use (i.e., hiking, biking, and horseback riding)* trails.

Table 6-10. Parks and Recreational Facilities within 0.25 Miles of Build Alternatives

Map ID	Name	Address	City
32	Chet Holifield Park and Community Center	1060 S. Greenwood Ave	Montebello
33	Woods Avenue Park	Verona St. and Woods Ave	Los Angeles
34	Atlantic Avenue Park	570 South Atlantic Blvd	Los Angeles
35	Belvedere Park Lake	3rd St and La Verne Ave	Los Angeles
36	Rio Hondo Spreading Grounds and ~~Bike~~ *Multi-Use* Trails	Not available	Pico Rivera
37	San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds and ~~Bike~~ *Multi-Use* Trails	Not available	Pico Rivera
38	Whittier Greenway Trail	Not available	Whittier

Page 55. The fourth paragraph in **Section 7.3.1.1.1**, Fire and Police Protection, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from the city of Pico Rivera and to update Metro operational information:

> Security issues, such as fare evasion, assault or robbery, could potentially occur at stations. As standard operating practice and as set forth in PM PSR-1(See **Section 8.0**), Metro would supplement existing police protection services by providing Transit Services Bureau officers and contracted police services at all new LRT facilities, as needed to ensure that adequate police protection services are provided. ~~In the fall of 2022,~~ *Beginning in October 2022,* Metro *has begun deploying* ~~would launch a three-year pilot transit ambassador program which would deploy~~ trained contract personnel on Metro's buses, bus stops, trains, and stations *to provide customer support*. Ambassadors ~~would be~~ *are* unarmed and travel the system or ~~be~~ *are present* at ~~fixed~~ stations to promote safety for riders and operators. *While not acting as security officers or replacing security officers, they provide a visible presence and support riders by connecting them with resources they may need such as providing directions or connecting them to other agencies and services as appropriate or warranted. They also help Metro to respond to issues more quickly by reporting maintenance, cleanliness, or safety concerns directly to the appropriate Metro department (Metro 2023).* ~~The primary role of the transit ambassador program is to be a visible presence (Metro, 2022).~~

Page 56. The second paragraph in **Section 7.3.1.1.2**, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

As identified in **Section 6.2.2**, there are several schools located adjacent to Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not result in the need for new or physically altered schools. No physical alterations to *Griffith Middle School*, Garfield High School, ~~or Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, or Esperanza College Prep* would be required for the schools to continue operating or to maintain school access because the LRT guideway would operate below the ROW of Atlantic Boulevard, as it would be underground in these areas, and the schools would not be impacted.

Page 57. The third paragraph in **Section 7.3.1.1.3**, Parks and Recreational Facilities, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Operation of Alternative 1 would not result in impacts to parks. There would be no acquisitions or reduction of access to parks that could require alteration or new construction of parks and recreational facilities in order to maintain park and recreation services. No physical alterations or impacts to Atlantic Avenue Park would occur because the LRT guideway would be underground. Chet Holifield Park is proximate to the ~~aerial~~ Greenwood station. Although the proposed station would provide additional access to the park, attendance is not likely to increase since this is a neighborhood-scale park that is unlikely to attract visitors from beyond the immediate vicinity. Similarly, the use of both the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Ground and associated ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails would not be affected, and trail use is not anticipated to notably increase. *The finish grade of the rail bridge crossings of the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River would maintain or increase clearance compared to the existing conditions. Therefore, no decrease in the clearance heights would occur that could restrict use of the multi-use trail crossings beneath the bridges.*

Page 60. The second paragraph in **Section 7.3.1.2.2**, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Alternative 1 would not require any physical alterations at nearby schools including: Griffith Middle School, Garfield High School, ~~Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, Esperanza College Prep*, Greenwood Elementary School, Ada S. Nelson Elementary School, and Washington Elementary School to accommodate an increased population or construction activities.

Page 61. The second paragraph in **Section 7.3.1.2.3**, Parks and Recreational Facilities, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Bridge replacement at the Rio Hondo and the San Gabriel River may inhibit access or require temporary closure of their respective ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails. ~~A short, t~~*T*emporary re-routing of the ~~bike~~ trail around the construction area would allow it to remain open continuously. The re-routing would not require substantial physical alterations or construction and would be accomplished *primarily* with signage and ground markings. While access to the ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails would be limited in the vicinity of the bridges while construction is occurring, access to other portions of the trail would be maintained uninterrupted during construction. As set forth in PM TRA-2, Metro standard practices shall include timing closures to minimize disruptions *to the public* and developing a Traffic Management Plan for construction activities *affecting* ~~for~~ parks and recreational facilities. *Development of a Traffic Management Plan will include coordination with affected jurisdictions along the route, which would include, but not be limited to, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.* Detours would ~~be provided to~~ provide safe access around the construction areas, and access to the ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails and other parks and recreational facilities would remain available; there would be no need for new or

physically altered parks and recreation, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service levels. Therefore, construction of Alternative 1 would have less than significant impacts on parks and recreational facilities.

Page 63. The fourth paragraph in **Section 7.3.2.1.1**, Fire and Police Protection, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from the city of Pico Rivera and to update Metro operational information:

Security issues, such as fare evasion, assault or robbery, could potentially occur at stations. As standard operating practice and as set forth in PM PSR-1, Metro would supplement existing police protection services by providing Transit Services Bureau officers and contracted police services at all new LRT facilities, as needed to ensure that adequate police protection services are provided. ~~In the fall of 2022, Beginning in October 2022,~~ Metro *has begun deploying* ~~would launch a three-year pilot transit ambassador program which would deploy~~ trained contract personnel on Metro's buses, bus stops, trains, and stations *to provide customer support*. Ambassadors ~~would be~~ *are* unarmed and travel the system or ~~be~~ *are present* at fixed stations to promote safety for riders and operators. *While not acting as security officers or replacing security officers, they provide a visible presence and support riders by connecting them with resources they may need such as providing directions or connecting them to services available through Metro's homeless outreach teams. They also help Metro to respond to issues more quickly by reporting maintenance, cleanliness, or safety concerns directly to the appropriate Metro department (Metro 2023).* ~~The primary role of the transit ambassador program is to be a visible presence (Metro, 2022).~~

Page 63. The second paragraph in **Section 7.3.2.1.2**, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

No physical alterations or disruptive impacts to the schools located in the vicinity of Alternative 2, *Griffith Middle School,* Garfield High School, ~~and or Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep, would occur* because the LRT guideway would operate below the ROW of Atlantic Boulevard. No physical alterations to *Griffith Middle School,* Garfield High School, ~~or Fourth Street~~ *4th* Street Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, or Esperanza College Prep,* would be required to continue operating or maintain school access.

Page 66. **Section 7.3.2.2.2**, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Since the construction of Alternative 2 would primarily take place underground, no physical alterations would occur at nearby schools, including Griffith Middle School, Garfield High School, ~~or Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, or Esperanza College Prep*.

Page 68. The third paragraph in **Section 7.3.3.1.1**, Fire and Police Protection, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from the city of Pico Rivera and to update Metro operational information:

Security issues, such as fare evasion, assault or robbery, could potentially occur at stations. As standard operating practice and as set forth in PM PSR-1, Metro would supplement existing local fire and police protection services by providing Transit Services Bureau officers and contracted police services at all new LRT facilities, as needed. This would help to ensure

adequate police protection services are provided. ~~In the fall of 2022,~~ *Beginning in October 2022,* Metro *has begun deploying* ~~would launch a three-year pilot transit ambassador program which would deploy~~ trained contract personnel on Metro's buses, bus stops, trains, and stations *to provide customer support*. Ambassadors ~~would be~~ *are* unarmed and travel the system or ~~be~~ *are present* at fixed stations to promote safety for riders and operators. *While not acting as security officers or replacing security officers, they provide a visible presence and support riders by connecting them with resources they may need such as providing directions or connecting them to services available through Metro's homeless outreach teams. They also help Metro to respond to issues more quickly by reporting maintenance, cleanliness, or safety concerns directly to the appropriate Metro department (Metro 2023).* ~~The primary role of the transit ambassador program is to be a visible presence (Metro, 2022).~~

Page 69. The second paragraph in **Section 7.3.3.1.2**, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

No physical alterations or impacts to schools located in the vicinity of Alternative 3, *Griffith Middle* School, Garfield High School, ~~and Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, and Esperanza College Prep* would occur because the LRT guideway would operate below the ROW of Atlantic Boulevard, as it would be underground in these areas. No physical alterations to Garfield High School, ~~or Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, or Esperanza College Prep* would be required for the schools to continue operating or to maintain school access.

Page 72. **Section 7.3.3.2.2**, Schools, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from LAUSD and updated existing conditions:

Alternative 3 would not require any physical alterations at nearby schools, including Griffith Middle School, Garfield High School, ~~Fourth Street~~ *4th Street* Elementary School, *4th Street Primary Center, Esperanza College Prep,* or Greenwood Elementary School.

Page 78. The third paragraph of **Section 7.4.1.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

There is the potential for an indirect impact given that new transit stations would be constructed in areas near parks and recreational facilities which would enable transit riders to visit these facilities, such as Chet Holifield Park which is located near the Greenwood station, and the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds and associated ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails located in the vicinity of Norwalk station.

Page 79. **Section 7.4.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Construction of Alternative 1 would not require the physical acquisition, displacement, or relocation of parks or other recreational facilities. Construction activities associated with Alternative 1 could result in temporary nuisances associated with intermittent increases in noise, dust, odors, and traffic delays, which could affect the use and physical quality of adjacent parks and recreational facilities, including Chet Holifield Park, the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River Spreading Grounds, and associated ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails. As discussed in the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Air Quality Impacts Report, Noise and Vibration Impacts Report, and Transportation and Traffic Impacts Report, however, these impacts would be less than significant with implementation of standard control measures. These effects would not

lead to increased use of parks or other recreational facilities. Construction activities would likely require intermittent sidewalk and lane closures and detours which could inhibit access to recreational facilities. The reconstruction of the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River bridges may require temporary closure or re-routing of the ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails. As set forth in PM TRA-2 (**Section 8.0**), Metro standard practices shall include timing closures to minimize disruptions *to the public* and developing a Traffic Management Plan for construction activities as discussed in the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Transportation and Traffic Impacts Report. *Development of a Traffic Management Plan will include coordination with affected jurisdictions along the route, which would include, but not be limited to, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.* Thus, access to parks and recreational facilities would be maintained during construction. Additionally, construction of Alternative 1 would not increase use of the parks and recreational facilities through population growth as a result of construction job opportunities.

Page 87. PM PSR-1 in **Section 8.0**, Project Measures, is hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.14** in this chapter.

Page 96. The third paragraph of **Section 11.2**, Alternative 1 Washington + MSF, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Bridge replacement at Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River may inhibit access or require temporary closure of respective ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails, although this effect would be reduced by re-routing of the bike trails around the construction area to allow them to remain open continuously. ~~A short, t~~*T*emporary re-routing of this nature would be unlikely to cause new physical impacts. The re-routing would not require substantial physical alterations or construction and would be accomplished *primarily* with signage and ground markings. Access to the ~~bike~~ *multi-use* trails as well as other parks and recreation facilities located near the alignment would be maintained during construction and there would be no need for new, expanded, or temporary park facilities to meet existing demand for parks and recreational facilities. Metro standard practices include timing closures to minimize disruptions *to the public* and developing a Traffic Management Plan for construction activities. *Development of a Traffic Management Plan will include coordination with affected jurisdictions along the route, which would include, but not be limited to, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.*

Page 102. **Section 13.0**, References Cited, is hereby revised to include the following reference in response to public comments from the city of Pico Rivera and to update Metro operational information:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. 2023. L.A. Metro Celebrates Official Launch of New Ambassador Pilot Program. Available at: https://www.metro.net/about/l-a-metro-celebrates-official-launch-of-new-ambassador-pilot-program/. Accessed April 12, 2023.

3.3.11 Appendix N Transportation and Traffic

Page 120. The first paragraph in **Section 8.3.1.1**, Alternative 1 Washington, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

Alternative 1 uses the existing street alignment and ROW when at-grade or aerial *segments,* and would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, as Alternative 1 would be designed, constructed, and operated per applicable State, Metro, and city design

criteria and standards, including adherence to design codes and standards such as the *California Division of* Occupational Safety and Health Administration (*Cal/*OSHA), ~~California OSHA,~~ California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), MUTCD, and Metro safety and security programs and standards (i.e., MRDC and Metro Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy).

Page 122. **Section 8.3.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 124. **Section 8.3.2.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 126. **Section 8.3.3.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 128. **Section 8.3.4.2.1**, Commerce MSF, and **Section 8.3.4.2.2**, Montebello MSF, are hereby revised as follows in response to public comments from DPR:

Safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, *multi-use trail users (i.e., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians),* and motorists would be maintained during construction using signage, partial lane closures, *and* construction barriers~~, and supervision by safety and security personnel at access points and throughout construction sites~~.

Page 136. **Section 8.4.4.1.2** Montebello MSF is hereby revised as follows for clarity:

As set forth in PM TRA-3, any roadway changes would be designed according to applicable MRDC, *state, and local design criteria and standards where applicable* including *fire code and* Fire/Life Safety Design Criteria and standards, and would provide adequate emergency access.

Page 138 – Page 140. The following project measures (PM TRA-1, PM TRA-2, PM TRA-3, and PM TRA-4) in **Section 9.0**, Project Measures, are hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.15** in this chapter.

Page 141 – Page 142. The following mitigation measure (MM TRA-1) in **Section 10.0**, Mitigation and Impacts After Mitigation, is hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.15** in this chapter.

3.3.12 Appendix O Tribal Cultural Resources

Page 29. The last paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.2**, Construction Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> MM TCR-3 requires *the contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare* a project–wide Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP) *to be implemented during construction* ~~to be developed and implemented by Metro~~. This document would address areas where potentially significant prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits and TCRs are likely to be located within the ADI based on background research, a geoarchaeological analysis, and Tribal consultation.

Page 46. The following mitigation measure (MM TRC-3) in **Section 8.0**, Mitigation and Impacts After Mitigation, is hereby revised to incorporate the same revisions as shown in **Section 3.2.16** in this chapter.

3.3.13 Appendix P Construction

Page 47. **Section 3.3.4.7**, Temporary Street and Lane Closures, is hereby revised as follows based on input from Caltrans:

> Street and lane closures may be necessary during construction of the project including potential closures during nights or on weekends. The extent and duration of the closures would depend on several factors, including the construction contract limits and individual contractors' choices, and would be coordinated with the appropriate city jurisdiction, ~~and~~ Los Angeles County (unincorporated), and *Caltrans*. Restrictions on the extent and duration of the closures can be incorporated into the project construction specifications.

3.3.14 Appendix Q Cumulative

Page 32. **Section 6.3.2** Related Projects, **Table 6-2** Related Projects within the DSA by Jurisdiction, is hereby updated as follows to include an additional project:

Table 6-2 Related Projects within the DSA by Jurisdiction

Fig. #	Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Description
8	Beverly Crossing Commercial Project- 9036 Beverly Boulevard	Commercial	Pico Rivera	Commercial retail space with that includes approximately 53,960 square feet of neighborhood retail and restaurants. Approved in 2020. Construction timeline is uncertain.
	Washington and Rosemead Boulevards Transit-Oriented Development Specific Plan	*Mixed-use commercial and residential*	*Pico Rivera*	*Plan proposes to rezone approximately 327 acres of land around the future Metro station for new mixed-use commercial and residential development, along with mobility and public realm improvements. The plan area is expected to accommodate more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use commercial development and approximately 31,000 square feet of mixed-use residential development.*
9	Sorensen XC, LLC	Industrial	Santa Fe Springs	Development of a 233,779 square foot concrete tilt-up industrial buildings, which is located at 8201 Sorensen Avenue.

Page 41. The third paragraph of **Section 7.8,** Biological Resources, is hereby revised as follows based on further Project analysis and consistency:

> Construction of related land development projects within the DSA, which encompasses the BRSA, and *Alternative 1* ~~Build Alternatives~~ would have the potential to spread invasive species *and tree pathogens if construction occurs in areas of exposed soil and affects vegetation communities*. Considered cumulatively, the potential to spread invasive species *and tree pathogens* from construction *in the rivers and spreading grounds (required for Alternative 1)* ~~of the Build Alternatives~~ and related projects would result in a cumulatively significant impact. However, with incorporation of mitigation measures, *Alternative 1* ~~all Project related~~ impacts under BIO-2 would be reduced to less than significant. The significant impact from the spread of invasive species would not be cumulatively affected by the related plans and projects because it would be reduced by mitigation measures to *prepare an Invasive Plant and Infectious Tree Disease Mitigation Plan and* clean construction equipment and avoid the spread of soil and plant material; therefore, the Project would not contribute any incremental impact.

Page 41 – Page 42. The last sentence of the last paragraph in **Section 7.9**, Geology, Seismicity, Soils, and Paleontological Resources is hereby revised as follows to correct a typo:

> Considered cumulatively with the plans and projects identified in **Section 6.0**, and even with implementation of MM GEO-1 through MM GEO-4~~MM GEO-5~~, as shown in **Table 8-1**, there would be a significant cumulative impact. The incremental impact from Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 would be cumulatively considerable.

Page 49. **Section 8.0** Mitigation Measures, **Table 8-1**, Summary of Mitigation Measure Applicability, is hereby revised as follows for consistency:

Mitigation Measure	Alternative 1 With Commerce MSF or Montebello MSF Site Option	Alternative 2 With Commerce MSF	Alternative 3 With Commerce MSF or Montebello MSF Site Option
Biological Resources			
MM BIO-1	Applicable	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-2	Applicable	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-3	Applicable	N/A	N/A
MM BIO-4	Applicable	Applicable	Applicable
MM BIO-5	Applicable	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~
MM BIO-6	Applicable	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~	*N/A* ~~Applicable~~

3.3.15 Appendix R Growth-Inducing

Pages 26 – 28. The second paragraph of **Section 7.1.1.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> While housing development would not be directly induced by the project, there would be opportunities where Alternative 1 could serve as a "catalyst" for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Land Use and Planning Impacts Report identifies *that there may be* opportunities within the DSA for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment. These are summarized briefly here by station and are presented in greater detail in the Land Use and Planning Impacts Report.

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured):** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Whittier:** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, a gas station, and miscellaneous services. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, there *may* exist~~s~~ potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Lambert:** Potential development would be limited to development of existing commercial and vacant parcels. The city of Whittier's land use controls associated with land use and zoning designations would limit the intensity of redevelopment. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed Lambert station are commercial uses. Any opportunities for development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies and regulations, including the *2021-2040 Envision Whittier General Plan*. With approximately 20 percent of the neighborhood surrounding the proposed station being currently residential, there *may be* ~~is~~ opportunity for joint-use development.

Page 29. **Section 7.1.1.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

Pages 30 - Page 31. Beginning with the second paragraph of **Section 7.1.2.1**, Subsection Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> While housing development would not be directly induced by the project, there would be opportunities where Alternative 2 could serve as a "catalyst" for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Land Use and Planning Impacts Report identifies *that there may be* opportunities within the DSA for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment. These are summarized briefly here by station and are presented in greater detail in the Land Use and Planning Impacts Report.

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured):** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Whittier:** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, a gas station, and miscellaneous services. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, there *may* exist~~s~~ potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

Page 32. The first paragraph of **Section 7.1.2.1**, Operational Impacts, Design Options, Atlantic/Pomona Station Option, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

Page 33. Beginning with the second paragraph of **Section 7.1.3.1**, Operational Impacts, is hereby revised as follows to improve clarity:

> While development would not be induced, there are opportunities where Alternative 3 could serve as a "catalyst" for economic revitalization and growth in areas where development has already occurred. The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Land Use and Planning Impacts Report identifies *that there may be* ~~many~~ opportunities within the DSA for joint development at station locations and other public/private transit-oriented development opportunities along the proposed alignment. These are summarized briefly here by station and are presented in greater detail in the Land Use and Planning Impacts Report.

- **Atlantic (Relocated/Reconfigured):** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station site are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, auto services, and a gas station. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

- **Whittier:** Opportunity to redevelop lower density commercial uses to higher density commercial and transit-oriented uses, consistent with the *East Los Angeles County Community Plan* land use goals. Properties anticipated to be acquired around the proposed station are commercial uses including restaurants, retail stores, a gas station, and miscellaneous services. Any anticipated re-development in this area would be consistent with existing land use characteristics (see **Section 6.1.4**), plans, policies, and regulations. Therefore, there *may* exist~~s~~ potential opportunities for joint-use development in the commercial parcels around the station. There *may* also exist potential opportunities for joint-use development (commercial/residential) in the commercial parcels around the station, as there are existing residential uses nearby.

3.3.16 Volume 2 Advanced Conceptual Design

The advanced conceptual drawings included in Volume 2 of the Recirculated Draft EIR for Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 have been updated and replaced based on advancements in the Project design and engineering. Updated drawings are provided in Appendix C of the Final EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.